00059228

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 25 June, 2016

# THE PENTATEUCH

## AND BOOK OF JOSHUA

B 2651

CRITICALLY EXAMINED

59228
a2

BY THE RIGHT REV.

JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO, D.D.

BISHOP OF NATAL.

---

'We can do nothing against the Truth, but for the Truth.'—*St. Paul*, 2 Cor. xiii. 8.

'Not to exceed, and not to fall short of, facts,—not to add, and not to take away,—to state the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,—are the grand, the vital, maxims of Inductive Science, of English Law, and, let us add, of Christian Faith.'—*Quarterly Review* on 'Essays and Reviews,' *Oct.* 1861, p. 369.

---

PART V.

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
1865.

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

# PREFACE.

CIRCUMSTANCES, which will be known to most of my readers, and for which I am not responsible, having kept me unexpectedly in England some months beyond what I had anticipated, I have been able to complete the Fifth Part of my Work on the Pentateuch, and to leave it thus behind me, as a token of farewell at once to my friends and to my adversaries.

I will here briefly state the contents of the present volume.

In Chap.I I have shown that a very large portion of the Book of Joshua is due to the same hand that wrote the Book of Deuteronomy.* From this it follows at once that *Moses*, at all events, could not have written Deuteronomy. It follows also, from the way in which the Deuteronomist appears to have blended his later additions with the older matter of Joshua, that we may find that he has also revised the first four Books of the Pentateuch, and made similar insertions in them.

In Chap.II I have given lists of the Elohistic portions of Genesis, as extracted by HUPFELD and BOEHMER, the two continental writers who have specially devoted themselves to the close critical examination of Genesis. And, comparing them

* I wish to call the attention of critical scholars to the proof in *App.*II (52, *note*), which shows that the formula in N.x.35, said to have been used at every movement of the Ark in the wilderness, is a *Deuteronomistic* insertion, and therefore, as I have maintained in (II.408), has been most probably imitated from Ps.lxviii.1.

with my own conclusions, I have shown that very great unanimity of opinion exists between us as to these portions, which constitute about *two-ninths* of the Book of Genesis, and in which 'Elohim' only is used as the Personal Name of God.

In Chap.III I have given a Table of the chief peculiarities in style and expression which distinguish the Elohistic part of Genesis, being very freely employed in it,—*twenty-nine* of them each on the average *ten* times,—but not at all in the other *seven-ninths* of Genesis.

In Chap.IV I have given a similar Table of more than a hundred different formulæ, which occur on the average each more than *ten* times—twenty of them *forty-seven* times—in these latter sections, but do not appear in the Elohistic portions.

Thus the reader will see at once, even without going further, that the matter due to the Elohist is distinguished in the plainest possible manner from the rest of Genesis.

In Chap.V I have drawn more particular attention to some of the most noticeable differences in tone and style, as also to the numerous *discrepancies* and *contradictions*, which exist between the Elohistic and the remaining parts of Genesis.

In Chap.VI I have shown, by numerous instances, that similar discrepancies exist in these remaining parts themselves, suggesting the possibility that in these also there may be found a difference of authorship. And, accordingly, I have given reasons for concluding that G.xiv belongs to a Jehovistic writer (the *Second Jehovist*), who has probably written no more than this of the Pentateuch, and also that G.xv, and some other short passages and notes, are *Deuteronomistic* interpolations.

In Chap.VII I have shown that in the matter which now remains, when the passages due to the above three writers have been removed,—about *three-fourths* of the whole Book

of Genesis,—there are some sections—about *one-tenth* of this remainder—which, as regards the use of the Divine Name, are also *exclusively Elohistic,* though differing entirely in style and phraseology from the old Elohistic matter, and agreeing substantially with the other *nine-tenths,* which are homogeneous throughout in tone and style, but employ, more or less freely, the name 'Jehovah.' These secondary Elohistic sections—which appear to be of *later* origin than those which constitute 'The Elohistic Narrative,' from their *referring to it,* and of *earlier* origin than the Jehovistic matter, from *its referring to them*—are assigned, in accordance with the views of most of the great continental critics, to a *Second Elohist,* who wrote between the Elohist and Jehovist, but *nearer to the latter.*

But I have shown also that the passages due to the *Second Elohist* and *Jehovist* do not seem to have formed,—as HUPFELD and BOEHMER, with some other critics, have thought,—complete, independent narratives, but were merely supplementary to the original story. And, further, I have given reasons for believing that the *Second Elohist* was not really different from the *Jehovist*—that the latter only appears to have made additions to the original work of the Elohist at *different periods* of his life.

In Chaps. VIII, IX, I have examined into the question as to the *age* of the Elohist, and have shown that he must have lived in the latter years of Saul,—and may, very probably, have been—as suggested in Part II—the Prophet SAMUEL,—an opinion in which I find myself substantially at one, not only with TUCH and others, but with the latest continental critic, BOEHMER, who, after having bestowed very great labour on the separation of the Book of Genesis,—having also had before him the standard treatise of HUPFELD,—has fixed the age of the Elohist within the first seven years of David's reign.

In Chaps.X–XV I have considered, in like manner, from the internal evidence, the age of the Jehovist, supposed by me to be identical with the Second Elohist. And I have shown that he must have written from shortly before the beginning of David's reign till shortly after the beginning of Solomon's. I have here had to examine closely into those facts of Scripture, which bear upon the origin of the Levitical Office in Israel.

In Chap.XVI I have considered the age of the *Second Jehovist*, have summed up the previous results, and drawn attention to the fact, that they seem to point unequivocally to the introduction of the name 'Jehovah,' as the name of the Covenant-God of Israel, in a later age than that assigned to it by the traditionary view, or even by some modern critics of eminence, *viz.* the Mosaic time. I have shown that this conclusion, to which we are first led by observing the peculiarity in the treatment of this Divine Name, which distinguishes the work of the Elohist, seems to be confirmed by that of the Jehovist,—by his using at first 'Elohim' exclusively—then introducing 'Jehovah'—first sparingly, then more and more freely,—till at last he comes to use it almost exclusively—a phenomenon which corresponds very much to what we observed in Part II in respect of the Psalms.

In Chap.XVII I have given separately the complete Elohistic Narrative, as it is now found imbedded in the Book of Genesis —one of the most ancient histories in the world—if not, indeed, *the* most ancient, which exists in the form of a written document. The reader will thus have before him the primitive story, upon which the complex narrative of Genesis is based.

In Chap.XVIII I have given all the successive supplementary additions, printed in different portions, according to their different ages, with a view to exhibit more clearly the process, by which the Book of Genesis appears to have been formed.

In Chap.XIX I have examined at length into the probable origin of the name 'Jehovah,' and have given reasons for supposing that it was gradually adopted by the Israelites, after their entrance into Canaan, from their coming into contact with the Syro-Phœnicians, with whom this name, or a name so like it as to be represented by Greek writers, Christian as well as heathen, by the very same letters, IAΩ, was the great mysterious name of their chief deity, the Sun, regarded as the source of Life, and hence called יחוה, 'He lives' or 'He makes to live,' which, either as a mere dialectic variety, or possibly as a real modification, appears in Hebrew as יהוה, 'He is' or 'He makes to be.'*

In Chap.XX, XXI I have shown how this view is supported by some of the actual facts of the religious history of Israel.

In Chap.XXII I have added some 'Concluding Remarks,' suggested by the results of this Enquiry.

I have then subjoined, for the use of Hebrew Students, a complete Analysis of the whole Book of Genesis, in which almost every line and word is brought under review, and any indications of style are carefully noted. Upon this Analysis the conclusions are based, which have formed the ground of my reasonings in the preceding Chapters. I believe these conclusions to be, in the main, sound and tenable. But, however this may be, it is satisfactory to know that the labour spent on this Analysis will not in any case have been spent in vain: since here are *facts*, which must at any rate be taken into account by all future labourers in this department of Biblical Criticism, and my register of which may afford some help, or at least save some tedious toil, to others in the prosecution of their own enquiries. I have tried several

* Gesenius, *Thes.p.*450, says that חָוָה, in its *primary* signification, is 'identical with חָוָה, חָיָה, חָיָה, all which forms have flowed from this last, as from a common source.' He suggests, also, *Thes.p.*577, that the Hebrew Sacred Name יהוה may perhaps mean, not *He is*, but *He makes to be*, that is, *Creator*, or, 'according to the primary force of the word, *He who gives life*, the same as מְחַיֶּה.'

experiments with the view of compressing and condensing this part of the volume. But I have found no method more satisfactory than that which I have here followed—none which would protect me from the charge, which (as experience has taught me) may be so readily made against me, of having understated, or suppressed, or distorted, some portion of the evidence. The student will here have *all* the evidence before him, and can turn at once to any chapter or verse in Genesis, and see the reasons for which it is assigned to this or that particular writer. For the general reader, perusing the work with friendly eyes, the Tables, as given in the preceding Chapters, exhibiting some of the main results of this Analysis, will probably suffice.

In App.I I have given a summary of some of the remarkable results, which have been very recently set forth, with singular originality, by Prof. Dozy of Leyden, as showing the Israelitish origin of the Sanctuary and Ancient Worship at Mecca. And I have explained how these results—so far as they may be admitted as probable—have a bearing upon our present investigation. At any rate, they deserve to be brought to the notice of English students of Biblical Literature, as exhibiting a splendid specimen of modern criticism, applied to the solution of a very interesting and hitherto entirely unsolved question.

In App.II I have replied at length to the remarks of the Rev. J. J. S. Perowne and the Bishop (Harold Browne) of Ely, upon my criticism of the Psalms in Part II.

In App.III I have translated a chapter from Movers's *Phönizie*, 'On the Name IAO,' which seems to throw much light upon the origin of the name 'Jehovah.'

I have mentioned above Bishop Browne's Reply to my criticism on the Psalms, which is fully discussed in App. II. This Reply is given in the fourth of 'Five Lectures,' which were

delivered by him, as Professor of Divinity, in the University of Cambridge, in the year 1863, on *The Pentateuch and the Elohistic Psalms.* I contented myself at the time with saying, in the Preface to my Part III.*p.*xiv,—

I find nothing in these 'Lectures' requiring me to modify any of my previous conclusions.

But, as this is the only attempt, as far as I am aware, which has been made up to this time, on the part of any University Divinity Professor, to impugn *publicly* the truth of my conclusions, as to the composite character and unhistorical nature of the narratives in the Pentateuch, in written words that may be examined and judged by *all*,—by myself, and by the public to whom I have appealed, as well as by a few private hearers,—it may be right that, before leaving England, I should assist my readers to estimate at their true value the reasonings of this eminent defender of the traditionary view,—one, indeed, who has been raised to the Episcopal Bench, as is generally understood, in a great measure as a reward of his labours, in endeavouring to confute, first, the 'Essays and Reviews,' and last, my own Work on the Pentateuch.

I need hardly say that, from the opinion which I had myself formed of the character of Professor BROWNE, as well as from the importance of his position, I turned with the greatest interest and some expectation to the perusal of these Lectures. But I must confess that I was painfully disappointed, and saw at once how little help I could expect to obtain, towards securing a free and fair discussion of the points at issue, even from one to whom I had looked so hopefully. He has written, indeed, courteously and kindly of myself personally; and he says, *p.*v—

I trust I have nowhere expressed myself with the bitterness or insolence of controversy.

Very gladly do I bear witness to the absence in his work of

all that 'bitterness' and 'insolence,' which has disfigured the addresses and writings of many of my adversaries, lay and clerical. And I should have added that, *in this respect*, Bishop BROWNE's 'Five Lectures' were a perfect specimen of what a Christian controversial work should be, except for one grave fault, which I feel obliged to notice. Bishop BROWNE has not been able to content himself, as a *Scholar*, with endeavouring to refute my arguments, or, as a *Divine*, with recommending earnestly to his pupils what he himself believes to be the truth; but he has also (I regret to say) allowed himself to use the unfair weapon of prejudice, and sprinkled his Lectures all over very freely with the words 'forge,' 'forger,' 'forgery,'* with which he brands the supposition of Samuel's having been concerned in composing the Elohistic story of the Pentateuch. Nay, to my extreme surprise, he says, *p.*19,—

> You know that in the First Part of his Work he (Bishop COLENSO) devotes himself chiefly to proving that the numbers in the Books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, are so extravagantly large as to have been utterly impossible, and that such exaggeration *stamps the whole Pentateuch with forgery!*

This appears to me to be a serious departure from the course of fair and honourable criticism. I have never used such words myself, nor ever wished or thought it right to use them, with reference to such a work as I imagine that of the Elohist to have been. On the contrary, I have plainly, from the first, condemned and rejected utterly the employment of such expressions, as unmerited by anything that we can know, or have any right to conjecture, as to the circumstances or intentions of the writer. Very many, in our day, no doubt, invest the Elohistic story—or rather the composite story in the Pentateuch—with a sanctity and infallibility, which make them shrink at first from

* 'forgery,' *p.*19, 'forger,' *p.*46, 'forged, forgery, forged,' *p.*47, 'forged, forging,' *p.*69, 'palm off, imposture, pious fraud, forger,' *p.*70.

even entertaining the idea of its having been written in the way, in which the results of critical enquiry, as set forth in this volume, plainly show it to have been composed. But what right have we to suppose that Samuel—or whoever else may have written the Elohistic narrative—*meant his people to receive it as divinely and infallibly true*, or even *as being the composition of Moses himself*—that he intended, in any sense, to 'palm' a 'forgery' upon them, as an authentic veritable narrative of the past ages, or as the genuine work of their great lawgiver? Would Bishop BROWNE call the writer of the Book of Job a 'forger,' and those passages 'forgeries,' in which he records the conversations in the Court of Heaven of 'Jehovah' and 'Satan,' all expressed in excellent Hebrew, or in which he represents Jehovah as answering Job out of the whirlwind, in the same choice Hebrew, describing the habits of the wild goat and hind, the wild ass and the buffalo, the peacock, stork, and ostrich, the hare, hawk, and eagle, the hippopotamus, and the crocodile, with all the grand exaggerations of Eastern imagery?—

> 'Out of his mouth go burning lamps, sparks of fire leap out;
> Out of his nostrils goeth smoke, as out of a seething-pot or caldron;
> His breath kindleth coals, and a flame goeth out of his mouth.' xli.19–21.

He does not surely believe that all the things related in the Book of Job are historical facts, or that the 'Book of Job' was written by Job himself. And yet the details of this story, and the conversations of Jehovah with Satan and Job, are recorded in the form of history, just as much so as the conversations of Jehovah with Noah and Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Moses and Aaron, in the 'Books of Moses.' Is there more 'dishonesty' —more deliberate 'forgery'—in a later writer ascribing to Moses the grand addresses in Deuteronomy, than in the writer of Job ascribing to Jehovah Himself the majestic poetry of xxxviii-xli?

In Chap.XXI I have found occasion to notice some portions of Bishop BROWNE's First Lecture. I will now consider the replies which he gives in his Second Lecture, 'On the Numerical Difficulties of the Pentateuch,' to my objections to the historical truth of the Pentateuchal story.

I. The first difficulty of any consequence is, that there were but four generations from Levi to Moses, and that in those four generations seventy souls could never have grown to more than 2,000,000. Now, though from Levi to Moses there may have been but four generations, *it must have been* because the generations in the family of Moses were abnormally few. *Eight or nine is the more probable number* for the generality of the descendants of Jacob. *p.*20.

That is to say, Bishop BROWNE deliberately sets aside, not merely the datum in G.xv.16, 'in the *fourth* generation they shall come hither again,' but the evidence of *all* the genealogies which are given in the Pentateuch, and repeated in the statements of the first and third Gospels. For the 'abnormally few' generations are not confined to the family of Moses and Aaron. They occur in *every* instance which is recorded in the Pentateuch or (with one exception) anywhere else in the Bible. They occur in the line of *Levi*, in the case of Moses, Aaron, Mishael, Elzaphan, Korah,—in the line of *Reuben*, in the case of Dathan and Abiram,—again, in the line of *Judah*, in the case of Achan, Jair, Nahshon, Bezaleel,—and once more, in the line of *Joseph*, in the case of Zelophehad. The sole exception is the genealogy of Joshua as given by the Chronicler in 1Ch.vii.20-27, which I have shown to be perplexed and contradictory, and which is found only in a Book full of errors, written two centuries after the Captivity and a thousand years after the commonly-received date of the Exodus, and standing alone even in that Book. Yet Bishop BROWNE quietly assumes that in each line of the descendants of Jacob there *must have been* 'eight or nine generations'—thus admitting, in fact, that the *Scriptural* account, as it stands, is incredible.

II. Moreover, there is no reason to assume, as Bishop COLENSO has assumed, that none but pure Israelites should have been counted in the numbers mentioned in Exodus. It is certain that Abraham had a retinue of 318 followers, who tended his flocks, and could be armed against his enemies. It is *almost as certain* that the family of Jacob, when it went down into Egypt, *must have been* accompanied by a corresponding number of shepherds and herdsmen. These would, no doubt, have been circumcised, and have been reckoned with the descendants of the patriarchs. *p.*21.

It seems to me almost incredible that any writer should have made the above suggestion, with the facts of the Bible narrative before him. Not only have we not the slightest indication of any such a company having gone down with Jacob into Egypt, but there are the plainest signs of the direct contrary. Rather, on his return from Padan-Aram, he says himself, 'I am few in number,' xxxiv.30.

It may be said, however, that he inherited afterwards, upon the death of Isaac, the bulk of the property of his father and grandfather. But then we have to weigh the following facts:—

(i) If Jacob had so many 'shepherds and herdsmen' at his command, why did he send his darling Joseph *alone*, to wander about in search of his brethren, in a country where not only human foes, G.xxxiv.30, but *wild beasts*, G.xxxvii.20,23, were to be dreaded?

(ii) The brothers are spoken of as 'feeding their flocks,' when Joseph came to them, and apparently they were *alone*, without any attendants. For what sign is there, in the whole story of their dealings with him, of the presence of a multitude of 'shepherds and herdsmen,' who might have delivered him from their hands, or, at least, reported their crime to their father?

(iii) How is it that not one of these servants accompanied the ten sons of Jacob, when they went down the first time to Egypt? For the whole story shows that they had no attendants—'they took down *every man his sack* to the ground, and opened every man his sack,'—'then they rent their clothes, and laded *every man his ass*, and returned to the city,'—'we are brought in, that he may seek occasion against us, and take us for bondmen and our *asses*,'—not a word being said about *servants*.

(iv) How would their *ten ass-loads* of corn have supplied food for these hundreds of shepherds and herdsmen for a whole year, see G.xlv.6, as well as for their own families, amounting, as we know, to seventy persons, 'besides Jacob's sons' wives,' xlvi.26,27?

(v) If Jacob had so many servants, and not only 'flocks and herds,' G.xlvii.1,

but 'camels' and 'asses,' G.xxxii.15, why did he not send some of these servants, with additional camels and asses, instead of sending merely his sons on foot with their asses, to bring food for his people, without a single servant or extra 'camel' or 'ass,' on the *first* occasion, or on the *second*?

(vi) If it be said, the *corn* was only needed for the use of Jacob and his sons, and not for the hundreds of famishing shepherds and herdsmen and their families, who might contrive to live upon such coarse and scanty food as the land of Canaan still supplied, yet the language used on each occasion, 'that we may live and not die,' G.xlii.2,xliii.8, shows that the corn was a *necessary* for *them*, and therefore also for their servants. Would Jacob, indeed, have sent off at last, and with such great distress of mind and extreme reluctance, his beloved Benjamin, if he only needed the superfluous luxury of a loaf of wheaten bread for himself?

III. In short, Bishop BROWNE's supposition is utterly untenable. Yet only by making *three* such assumptions,—

(i) That a special blessing of fruitfulness was given to the Israelites in Egypt, though we have no trace of such fruitfulness in any of the families, whose numbers are stated in the story,*—

(ii) That there were 'eight or nine' generations, instead of *four*, as the Bible says,—

(iii) That hundreds of 'circumcised followers' went down with Jacob into Egypt, and their descendants were numbered with the genuine Israelites, in direct contradiction to the whole tenor of the Bible narrative, and the express words of D.x.22,—

'Thy fathers went down with threescore and ten persons; and now the Lord thy God hath made thee as the stars of heaven for multitude,'—

Bishop BROWNE is able to say, *p.*22,—

We can easily believe that there may have been at the time of the Exodus 600,000 men able to bear arms.

Even then, however, he adds, *p.*25,—

Still, in any view of the subject, it would be wrong to deny that the numbers of the Exodus are inordinately great, and proportionately puzzling. But then, when the whole story is professedly miraculous, is it reasonable, in the consideration, to keep out of sight miracle altogether?

* Zelophehad had only *five* children, N.xxvii.1,—Aaron *four*, N.xxvi.60,—Amram, Izhar, Uzziel, Korah, each *three*, N.xxvi.59, E.vi.21,22,24; Moses had *two*, E.xviii. 3,4; Eleazar had *one*, E.vi.25.

But a 'miracle' cannot make *twice-two* to be *three* or *five*.

IV. Accordingly, having obtained these numbers by the above processes, Bishop BROWNE is now puzzled what to do with them. It was a matter of great difficulty to get them; but, having got them, he finds himself pressed by the consequences of his own success, and would, if he could, get rid of them. He says,—

If for 600 [thousand men fit to bear arms] we might read 60, all would be clear; every numerical difficulty worth thinking of would vanish at once. *p.*26.

I utterly deny this. I have repeatedly challenged those who have made this suggestion to assume a reduced number, and test it by application to the repeated enumerations which occur in the Pentateuch. It is surely time that this idea of a possible reduction of the numbers should be banished from any work on this subject, professing to be a real and genuine scientific enquiry. And so, in fact, Bishop BROWNE himself admits in a note, *p.*26,—

Sixty thousand would, perhaps, be as much too small as six hundred thousand seems too large a number. On the whole, notwithstanding the admitted difficulty of the large numbers, *it is very questionable whether the difficulties would not be greater on the supposition that the numbers were much less.*

Yet in the text he had just said, as above quoted,—

If for 600,000 we might read 60,000, *all would be clear; every numerical difficulty worth thinking of would vanish at once!*

V. Again, Bishop BROWNE, *p.*22, quotes Bishop OLLIVANT as an authority for the suggestion, that the disproportion of the firstborn males to the whole population of Israel—

resulted partly from the fact that polygamy probably existed in Egypt, and that only the firstborn of the *first* wife would be reckoned the firstborn.

With all due respect for my episcopal brethren, I can only say that, whether polygamy was practised or not in Egypt, the words of E.xiii.12 seem to make it plain that the firstborn of *every* mother is meant,—

Thou shalt set apart unto Jehovah *all that openeth the matrix*, and *every firstling* that cometh of a beast which thou hast.

Let the reader compare the second of the above italicised expressions with the first; since 'every firstling of a beast' does not mean, surely, only the first progeny of every *male* beast. Or, if any doubt remain, let him consider those of E.xiii.2 :—

'Sanctify to me all the firstborn, whatsoever *openeth the womb* among the children of Israel, of man and of beast: it is mine.'

VI. We know that circumcision, the very bond of the Covenant, the initiatory rite of Judaism, was neglected till the people came to Gilgal, Jo.v.2-6. *p.*22.

As if this fact itself, which Bishop BROWNE states so quietly, did not involve a stupendous difficulty, as great as any which I have set forth in Part I! For who can believe that Moses, after having actually written the account in G.xvii, of the solemn institution of the rite by Almighty God Himself, as the very sign and seal of His Covenant, with that tremendous sanction, *v.*14,—

'The uncircumcised manchild, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, *that soul shall be cut off from his people*, he hath *broken My covenant*,'—

after having been expressly warned in person of the danger of neglecting the rite by the occurrence recorded in E.iv.24-26,—after having been again reminded of his duty in this respect by the words pronounced to him by Jehovah on the occasion of the first Passover, on the very night of the Exodus, E.xii.48,—

'And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the Passover to Jehovah, *let all his males be circumcised*, and then let him come near and keep it . . . for *no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof*,'—

would yet—under the holy mount itself, fresh from his daily communings with God,—when they rested for nearly twelve months together in one place, and everything—place, time, circumstances—combined to assist the discharge of this primary duty,—have allowed the people entirely to neglect having their children circumcised, during all his lifetime, for forty years together? The thing is utterly incredible; and no stronger

proof of the unhistorical character of the Pentateuchal story can be produced than the very fact itself, to which Bishop BROWNE appeals as helping him partially out of a difficulty.

VII. We know that the Passover itself must have been at least imperfect, at a time when there was no wheat from which to make unleavened bread. *p.*22.

And, of course, this is true. The only question is, How, then, did they manage to keep the second Passover under Mount Sinai at all; N.ix.1–5,* when their flour had long been spent, and they had been living on manna for nearly twelve months, E.xvi? And yet they are said to have kept it *strictly*,—

'*According to all the rites of it, and according to all the ceremonies thereof, shall ye keep it*,' N.ix.3;

'And they kept the Passover on the fourteenth day of the first month at even, in the wilderness of Sinai, *according to all that Jehovah commanded Moses*, so did the children of Israel,' N.ix.5.

And at this very time it was laid down, *v.*13,—

'Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying . . . The man that is clean, and is not in a journey, and forbeareth to keep the Passover, even the same soul *shall be cut off from among his people*; because he brought not the offering of Jehovah in his appointed season, *that man shall bear his sin*.'

VIII. It is hard also to believe, if the Pentateuchal narrative is historically true, that, as Bishop BROWNE says, *p.*23,—

The Mosaic ordinances, as regards sacrifice and the like, were at least very imperfectly observed during the wanderings in the wilderness:—

when the Tabernacle, with its Brazen Altar, was expressly built, and the Priests and 22,000 Levites expressly set apart, for the very purpose of carrying out these ordinances; and various commands such as these are recorded, which refer expressly to the '*camp*' in the wilderness, *e.g.*—

* Bishop BROWNE seems to have lost sight altogether of the account of *this* Passover, as he speaks of the 'first true Passover' being celebrated at the end of the forty years at Gilgal, *p.*22. Or does he mean to say that this was *not* a 'true Passover'? Let any one read the passage in which it is described, N.ix.1–14, and see if the Scripture story affords the slightest ground for saying this.

'What man soever there be of the house of Israel, that killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat, in the *camp*, or that killeth it out of the *camp*, and bringeth it not unto the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, to offer an offering unto Jehovah before the Tabernacle of Jehovah, blood shall be imputed unto that man,—he hath shed blood,—and *that man shall be cut off from among his people.*' Lxvii.3,4.

IX. And, after all, Bishop BROWNE himself is compelled to make some remarkable admissions, which I commend to the consideration of the attentive reader.

It is generally believed that it ['the book of the Law'] may have been *put together after the time of Moses. It may have gone through some such changes as happened to the poems of Homer, collected by one, and re-edited by another.* p.29.

Suppose we say, as some have said, that 'Every book, every chapter, every verse, every word, every syllable, every letter, was the direct utterance of the Most High,'—still, is it possible to add that, in the transmission down to us, every word, syllable, and letter, has been *infallibly and unalterably preserved*? p.30.

Hence, even if Bishop COLENSO's arithmetical objections could be proved valid to the utmost, they would not disprove the original inspiration of Moses, nor the preservation of his writings to us; but would show only that there had not been a miraculous protection of them from *slight corruptions* in the text, which in various ways *might have affected, most probably and easily, the numbers in the Pentateuch.* p.32.

It is something to allow that the Pentateuch—

may have gone through some such changes as happened to the poems of Homer,—

especially when it is remembered that these poems are believed by most scholars to have been written in different ages, and that very great doubt exists as to whether Homer himself ever lived.

But, with reference to the last quotation, Bishop BROWNE shows that he is very well aware that the numbers, which betray the unhistorical character of the whole story of the Exodus, are *not* 'corrupted,'—that there is positively not the slightest ground for making the suggestion that they *may have been* corrupted,—that you cannot change or take out the present number, 600,000, without tearing the whole fabric of the history to pieces. For he has said, p.26:—

I must freely confess, this solution of the problem [*viz.* by reducing the numbers from 600,000 to 60,000] is not so simple and satisfactory as it sounds at first.

The number 600,000 does not stand alone. In the first two chapters of Numbers we have all the constituents of that number. Twice over the number of fighting men in each tribe is mentioned, and the second time they are arranged in four camps, the camp of Judah, the camp of Reuben, the camp of Ephraim, the camp of Dan: the number in each camp is given, and in both cases the sum is 603,550 fighting men above twenty years of age. All the way through the history, the numbers, more or less, correspond; and yet it is not the simple recurrence of *one figure*, which might have suffered equally in every place from error of transcription.

After writing the above, I cannot, I must confess, understand how Bishop BROWNE could have allowed himself to spend several pages in arguing that my objections would only show—

that there had not been a miraculous protection of them [the Mosaic writings] from *slight corruptions in the text*, which in various ways might have affected, *most probably* and most easily, the numbers in the Pentateuch.

I shall refrain from making any remarks on the above, except to repeat that, when Bishop BROWNE wrote, *p.*29—

Without miraculous intervention, the numbers in the writings of Moses were a thousand-fold more liable to have become corrupted than those in the writings of the great Greek historians—

he knew, as we have seen, that the main numbers of the Pentateuch have *not* been corrupted,—that they are checked and counterchecked in so many ways, that there is really no pretence for speaking of 'corruption' in their case.

X. I venture to say that much greater difficulties than *inaccuracy in numerals* would not invalidate the general truth of the Persian history of Herodotus, or the Athenian history of Thucydides, or the retreat of the 10,000 related by Xenophon.

*Confusion or exaggeration of numbers*, if such can be proved against it, would not justify us in rejecting the general correctness of any ordinary history of the extremely remote antiquity of the history of the Exodus. *p.*29.

I answer that the cases supposed have nothing whatever in common with the case in the Pentateuch. What credit should we give to the details of Xenophon's narrative, if, starting with 10,000, he had gone on to describe his doings as that of a general of a *million* of men, sending 50,000 here and there, losing tens of thousands by plagues and other accidents,

and, beside all this, deliberately and systematically falsifying the numbers of his troops throughout, even when professing to give the exact results of two different marshallings, which he himself had superintended?

Yet this is just what Moses, if he was really the writer of the Pentateuch, must be supposed to have done. For the '70 souls' of Jacob's house might fairly have produced 5,000 warriors at the time of the Exodus (as I have shown in I.118): yet they are stated as amounting to 600,000. And this number, 600,000, is part of the very framework of the story of the Exodus, and is certainly due to Moses himself, if that story in the main was written by him. *He must have known the correct numbers of the Israelites, if he himself numbered them twice,*—under Sinai, in N.i,ii, and in the plains of Moab, N.xxvi,—besides taking their capitation-fees, E.xxxviii.25–28, for the building of the Tabernacle. If, therefore, these numbers are enormously exaggerated, they must have been falsified—Bishop BROWNE would say 'forged'—by Moses himself throughout,—which it is impossible for a moment to suppose. It seems to me far more respectful and reverent for the character of Moses—and also for the character of the Bible-record itself—to conclude, as I have done, that the story of the Exodus, if for this very reason only, *must* have been written by *later* hands—of men who were not even eye-witnesses of the facts which they record.

XI. It has been observed by critics, as a proof that Deuteronomy was not written by Moses, that the writer speaks freely of places in the land of Canaan, as if he was quite familiar with them—in fact, had long lived in Canaan:—

'Thou shalt put the blessing upon mount Gerizim, and the curse upon mount Ebal. Are they not on the other side Jordan, by the way where the sun goeth down, in the land of the Canaanites which dwell in the plain over against Gilgal, beside the terebinths of Moreh?' D.xi.29,30.

Bishop BROWNE accounts for this by saying, *p.*79—

'Moses must surely have had much knowledge of the geography from his intimate acquaintance with the lives and wanderings of the patriarchs of his race. But, moreover, when for forty years he fed the flocks of Jethro in the wilderness of Sinai, it is almost a matter of course that he should have become familiar with the neighbouring plains of Palestine, which not only his habits as a Bedouin herdman, but his patriotic remembrance of his forefathers, must inevitably have prompted him to visit.

But how did the *Israelites* before the Exodus acquire this familiarity with the minute details of the geography of Canaan, —so that such words as the above might have been addressed to them by word of mouth, in a *speech* of Moses, not merely recorded by way of reference in a book?

XII. Again, it has been observed that the Deuteronomist, writing in a *later* age, in the land of Canaan, speaks very naturally of the plains of Moab, in which he supposes Moses to have delivered the addresses in Deuteronomy, as the land '*on the other side* of Jordan'; whereas Moses, standing in the trans-Jordanic land itself, could not possibly have used such an expression in describing it. But Bishop BROWNE says, *p.*80:—

It is but likely, and it may have been most wisely permitted, that copyists or revisers should have replaced the original expressions (of 'the *other* side Jordan,' for instance) by those which afterwards would have been more intelligible (as 'on *this* side Jordan'—*i.e.* in the land of the promised inheritance).

Bishop BROWNE meant probably to say just the reverse of what he has really said, *viz.* that copyists may have changed the original 'on *this* side,' which Moses wrote, into the expression which would afterwards be more intelligible, *viz.* 'on the *other* side,' as it now stands. But then we ask, How can we conceive Moses, himself stationed in the plains of Moab, to have written in D.i.1, 'These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel *on this side* Jordan in the wilderness, &c.?' What possible reason could he have had for saying 'on this side Jordan,' when they had never yet crossed to the *other* side? Or, if it

be said that a later writer may have inserted this introductory passage, D.i.1–5, in which he tells us—

'These be the words which Moses spake *on the other side of Jordan*,' *v.*1,—'*On the other side of Jordan*, in the land of Moab, began Moses, &c.,' *v.*5—

(though the language of this passage agrees exactly with that of the whole Book), yet what later writer could have been so absurd as to make utter nonsense for later readers out of words, which originally, as Moses wrote them, stood correct and intelligible? Thus in D.iii.8 Moses is supposed by Bishop Browne to have written originally—

'And we took at that time out of the hand of the two kings of the Amorites the land that was *on this side* Jordan'—

but a later writer altered the expression to 'the land that was *on the other side* of Jordan;—just as if, supposing that Cæsar had said, in an address to his troops when in Gaul, 'We have conquered the countries *on this side* the Alps,' a later editor could by any possibility have altered his words, and made him say, 'We have conquered the country on *the other side* of the Alps,' because in later days it was called Trans-Alpine Gaul!

I will now examine Bishop Browne's principal arguments in his Third Lecture, where he treats of the question of 'Elohism and Jehovism in Genesis.'

I. It seems, *if the history of Exodus be true*, that the Israelites either *had never known* the name of 'Jehovah,' or *had forgotten* it, until it was revealed by Divine teaching to Moses. *p.*38.

Then, how does Bishop Browne account for the fact that the *mother* of Moses was called *Jo*-chebed, E.vi.20, N.xxvi.59? Or what is to be said of the many names compounded with Jehovah, which are recorded by the Chronicler, as the names of persons who lived *during the time of the sojourn in Egypt*,—Azar*iah* and Rea*iah*, Judah's grandsons, 1Ch.ii.8,iv.2, Hezron's wife, Ab*iah*, ii.24, and grandson, Ahi*jah*, ii.25, Issachar's

grandson, Rephaiah, vii.2, and great-grandson, Izrahiah, and great-great-grandsons, Obadiah, Joel, Ishiah, vii.3, Benjamin's grandson, Abiah, vii.8, &c. &c.? Will it be said, these are only *modern versions* of the old names, with *Jah* inserted instead of *El*? But in one of them, Joel, we have *both* names: what is to be made of this? Is it not plain that, 'if the history of Exodus be true,' then the notices about this name 'Jochebed,' and the statements of the Chronicler, *cannot* be historically true —in fact, Bishop BROWNE would say, must be 'forgeries'?

II. It is difficult, indeed, to gather whether he does really suppose the name of 'Jochebed' to be a 'forgery' or not. In one sentence, *p.*47, he says:—

> That these [names compounded with Jehovah] should have been rare before the days of Moses, *perhaps unknown till then*, is but what we might expect;

in the next he says:—

> Jochebed, the name of Moses' mother, is *almost the only* name of a person,—Moriah, which is of doubtful etymology, the only name of a place,—formed upon this principle before the Exodus.

Here, then, we have Bishop BROWNE declaring that Jochebed is '*almost the only* name of a person' compounded with Jehovah 'before the Exodus.' He would seem, therefore, to have been *aware* of the existence of *some* other names of this kind, viz. those in the Chronicles, such as those quoted above, since there are *no others* to which he could have referred by the expression 'almost.' Yet of these names I have given as many as *fifteen* (II.306), of persons who lived, according to the Chronicler, *before* the Exodus. When, therefore, Bishop BROWNE says that Jochebed is 'almost' the only name of this kind, does he mean that these numerous names of the Chronicler are mostly 'forgeries'? Or, rather, does he 'brand with the stamp of forgery' the name 'Jochebed' itself, when he says that such names were 'perhaps *unknown* till the days of Moses'?

III. Bishop BROWNE then gives, *p.*40—

an explanation simple, possible, and probable, of the difference of style and of the difference of language in different parts of the Book of Genesis.

His idea is that Moses may have written the Elohistic narrative 'soon after the Exodus,' and the Jehovistic 'in the last days of the wanderings.' But these are his own words, *p.*39 :—

Suppose that, soon after the Exodus, he was moved to write the history of creation, of the generations of Noah and Abraham, of the wanderings of their forefather Jacob, of the going down of Joseph, and afterwards of his father and brethren, into Egypt. A brief record of this kind would have been a very fitting work to be undertaken by this great lawgiver, and to be borne about with his people in their wanderings through the wilderness. But a fuller history, carried down even to the then present date, may have been reserved for the last days of their wanderings, when Moses himself was allowed to see the Promised Land from the summit of Pisgah. . . .

Now, if this actually took place, it is equally probable that in the earlier history Moses would use the well-known name of God, Elohim, and would defer the constant use of Jehovah till his people had become more thoroughly familiar with it. For, perhaps, thirty years a record of this kind may have been in the ears and in the mouths of all the hosts of Israel. . . . No wonder, then, when the great writer enlarged and interpolated his original MS.,—no wonder, I say, if he retained the well-known, much-read, and much treasured original, in the very words in which he had penned it thirty or even forty years before. . . . In the more recent portions of his books, the portions interpolated in the older parts, and the portions added at the end of them, he might well have introduced the more sacred and now long-known name of the Almighty. But the original passages, especially those most cherished and revered, would doubtless have been left as they had been written, read, and learned.

Bishop BROWNE does not seem to have been aware that one point is fatal at once to his theory, *viz.* the fact that certain sections, in which the name 'Elohim' is used exclusively, are almost *identical in style with the Jehovistic*, yet are *entirely distinct from the old Elohistic narrative*, which forms the basis of the Pentateuch. The proofs of this are given abundantly in this volume; but the fact itself will be admitted by all, who have carefully examined into the question. And, again, these *later Elohistic* passages, *e. g.* G.xx.1–17, xxi.8–20,

&c.,—as well as the *Jehovistic*, to which they are closely allied, and which carry down the narrative to the very last year of the Exodus, N.xxxvi.13,—are totally distinct in style and tone from the Book of Deuteronomy, supposed to have been written in that same last year.

IV. Bishop BROWNE, however, is not satisfied with having *one* hypothesis, 'simple, possible, and probable,' to explain these phenomena. 'Let us pass,' he says, 'to the other hypothesis.'

If Moses wrote the whole Pentateuch, not, as I have supposed possible, at two different periods, but at one period, and that near the end of the journeyings in the wilderness, then, what could have hindered but that, in relating the more ancient parts of his history, he should have used ancient documents? . . . Probably, among the people of Israel, during their 200 years of captivity in Egypt, the religious history of their race would have been known, and cherished, and taught to their children. The very syllables would have been guarded with care, in which they had been delivered to them by the lips of Jacob and Joseph. Moses only acted with his wonted wisdom if he took these traditions and embodied them in his history. Of course, I am supposing them to have been true. It is not likely that the faithful fathers of their race would have handed down to them traditions of falsehood. . . .

Now this hypothesis, again, would fully account for the difference between the Elohistic and Jehovistic portions of Genesis. The *ancient* records, whether written or oral, would pretty certainly have been *Elohistic*; for otherwise the people could not have been ignorant or forgetful of the great name of their Creator. The portions, written and mingled in with the traditional portions by Moses, would, on the other hand, be most probably *Jehovistic*,—Moses himself being, as it [? he] has been called, the great Jehovist [? Jehovistic] writer. *p.*40–42.

No doubt, it is often thought that there were Jehovistic, as well as Elohistic, documents, and that Moses used sometimes the one and sometimes the other. The reasons, which I have given in the text, incline me to think it more probable that, if the documentary theory be true, the documents were Elohistic, Moses himself being the Jehovist, and perhaps even inserting the name Jehovah in some of the Elohistic passages. *p.*42,*note.*

Unfortunately, again, there is one point which is at once fatal to this second theory, viz. the fact that this account of the revelation of the Divine Name to Moses in E.vi.2–7,—which certainly was not one of the 'ancient' documents, and which certainly

also *must* have been written (one would say) by Moses himself, if any part of the history was,—is due undoubtedly to the very same hand which wrote G.i.,&c.xvii,xxiii,&c., — which wrote, in short, the *old Elohistic narrative.* The proofs of this also are abundantly given in this volume; but the fact itself will be admitted by every critic of note. And the circumstance, that Bishop BROWNE does not seem to have been aware of it, is only another indication of the loose, superficial way, in which these important questions have been studied hitherto even by eminent Scholars and Divines in England.

V. We have seen that Bishop BROWNE has admitted that—

> If the history of the Exodus be true, the Israelites either had never known the name of Jehovah, or had forgotten it, until it was revealed by Divine teaching to Moses.

But he clearly inclines to the latter of these two alternatives, *viz.* that the Israelites had 'forgotten' the name 'Jehovah.'

> May it not be that the name Jehovah was an ancient and primitive name of God, by which He was known more or less to Adam and afterwards to the Patriarchs, but that it had not been the ordinary description by which He was spoken of, that it had never carried to their minds the same deep significance, which it bore afterwards to the covenant-people of Israel? . . . And so, according to the full significance of this peculiar designation, God made Himself known to Moses as He never had been known to his forefathers. And farther, *it is probable* that, perhaps, even before the going down into Egypt that name had been well-nigh *forgotten. p.*43.

Yet Jacob is supposed to have heard that wonderful declaration, xxviii.13, 'I am *Jehovah,* the Elohim of Abraham thy father, and the Elohim of Isaac, &c.'—upon which he exclaimed, *v.*16, 'Surely *Jehovah* is in this place, and I knew it not!' And Leah and Rachel used the name familiarly in giving names to their children, xxix.32,33,35,xxx.24, as did also Laban and Jacob in conversation, xxx.27,30,xxxi.49, and Jacob in prayer, xxxii.9, and even in his dying moments, xlix.18. Nay, as we have seen, the name Jehovah appears in the name of the

mother of Moses, and, according to the Chronicler, in those of several of the grandsons and great-grandsons of the sons of Jacob! Unless these names, and the other statements, noticed above, are 'forgeries,' how can it have been 'forgotten'?

But, once more, a single point—which is disclosed by careful enquiry, as shown in this volume—is fatal to the above view, *viz.* the fact that the *Elohist* abstains *throughout his narrative* from using the name 'Jehovah' at all, *until* he has recorded its revelation to Moses. Hence it follows that he *did* mean the statement in E.vi.3—

'I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by El-Shaddai, but by My Name Jehovah was I not known to them,'—

to be understood as saying that the Name was actually *not known at all* to the Patriarchs.

VI. In the second place, let us remember, that when Moses relates the conversations of our first parents, and of the Patriarchs after them, *it is not to be imagined that he gives us the very words they spoke!* [If the Bishop of Natal had said this, instead of the Bishop of Ely!] We have no authority for saying that Hebrew was the language of Paradise. In all probability it was not. Hence, when Eve is recorded to have said, 'I have gotten a man of Jehovah,' we must read the passage as a Hebrew translation of what she really said. And if so, then the name 'Jehovah,' introduced into the speech by the sacred historian, is only intended as the rendering of the ancient name of the Almighty by that name. . . . The same is probably true even of Abraham; for, though it appears that Jacob spoke Hebrew, it is pretty certain that in his native land Abraham had spoken, not Hebrew, but the Aramæan dialect, which we find to have been afterwards spoken by his kindred in his birth-place. *p.*44.

To be sure, the Bishop is met with the fact, as he himself admits, that—

Eve is said to have called her first-born *Cain*, in reference to her speech at his birth, the first word of which was *Canithi*, 'I have gotten.'

But he gets over this difficulty by supposing, *p.*45, that—

If she did not speak Hebrew, the real name of her son was probably something to us unknown, to which the Hebrew word 'Cain' corresponded;

and by producing double names, meaning the same in Syriac and Greek, *e.g.* Thomas-Didymus, Cephas-Peter, Tabitha-Dorcas.

But Bishop Browne has lost sight of the fact that there is not the slightest analogy between the case of 'Cain' and that of the other three names. 'Thomas' and 'Didymus' both mean 'twin'; 'Cephas' and 'Peter' both mean 'rock'; 'Tabitha' and 'Dorcas' both mean 'gazelle.' But Eve is said to have called her son 'Cain' in Hebrew with express reference to the *sound* of the Hebrew word *Canithi*. It would be a singular coincidence, certainly, if the sounds of the two words corresponded not only in the Hebrew, but also in the primeval language, of which the words in G.iv.1 are a *translation*. But the relation between these two languages must in that case have been very singular indeed; since we find another allusion of the very same kind in reference to Eve's third son, Seth: for we read, iv.25—

'She called his name *Sheth*, for Elohim hath appointed (*shath*) me another son.'

Again, Adam's name is derived from *ădamah*, 'ground,' Eve's (*khavvah*) from *khavah*, 'live'; and Adam says, 'She shall be called woman (*Ishah*), because she was taken out of man (*Ish*),' ii.23. Nay, Adam gave names to all creatures; and 'whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof,' ii.19—in the *primeval* or *Hebrew* tongue?

So, again, Lamech called his son *Noakh*, v.29, from *nikhem*, 'comfort.' And as to Abraham, what is his old name, 'Abram,' which he had in his native land, but good Hebrew, *Ab-ram* = 'high father,' or what 'Sarai,' but Hebrew = 'my princess?'

Are all these *fortuitous* coincidences between the primeval language and the Hebrew? And are we really to believe that the Divine creative utterances in G.i, and the Divine conversations in G.ii,iii,iv, were really expressed originally in the primeval tongue, but have been translated into the Hebrew?

We have now considered both Bishop BROWNE's methods of explaining the 'Elohism and Jehovism of the Pentateuch,' with respect to which he says, *p.*45,—

> Now these explanations are surely possible solutions of the difficulty which Bishop COLENSO declares to be insuperable. *I firmly believe that one of these solutions is indeed the true* (!!)

I have examined at length Bishop BROWNE's 'Fourth Lecture, in which he treats of the Psalms, in the Second Appendix to this volume. His Fifth (and last) Lecture contains a number of general arguments, loosely put together, which are based on statements sometimes true, sometimes fallacious, but do not require from me any particular notice, after the careful consideration which I have given to the more important parts of his Work. The reader will find, however, a few observations upon some of the statements of this, as well as the First, Lecture in the Chapter of 'Concluding Remarks' at the end of this Part.

Let me now express my grateful sense of the service, which the venerable Bishop of LIMERICK has rendered to the cause of Truth and true Religion by the following utterances, which I extract from his recent Charge, delivered in the cathedral of Limerick, Sept. 29, 1864.

I. The *Church of Rome* maintains that the Bible must be received on the authority of the Church, and no other.* She contends that, if we were to enquire into the grounds, on which we receive these documents as containing a revelation from God,

---

* This is just what Bishop GRAY maintains in the *Church of South Africa*:

'To sum up, we believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God, *because the Church*, under the guidance of the Spirit of God, *declared them to be such.*'—*Charge to the Clergy of Natal*, *p.*34.

'That Creed [the Apostles'], though in strictest accordance with Scripture, is a witness in addition to Scripture. *Both owe their origin to the Church*, under the Inspiration of the Spirit of God.'—*Sermon at Maritzburg*, *p.*13.

'*How do I know for certain that the Bible is the Word of God*,—what the true Canon is,—in what light I am to regard the Sacred Scriptures,—*except through the*

we should only involve ourselves in a labyrinth, from which there is no clue to conduct us, and that, whenever we desert that high authority, errors and contentions, and ultimately infidelity and impiety, have been the results. . . .

*We*, on the other hand, maintain that our *sole reliable ground* for receiving such documents is historical testimony. True, it may be attended with great labour to trace up the links of the chain,—a labour surpassing the reach of any one life, however long and learned. But this labour seems to have been originally designed for us. If we have been doomed to eat the bread of this life in the sweat of our face, it may be the same in attaining that of the life to come. . . .

II. The next point is with regard to the *interpretation* of the Bible, a point closely connected with the former, though they are quite distinct in their respective operations. By the one we ascertain what an author has actually written; by the other what is his meaning. . . .

The *Church of Rome* maintains that the *interpretation*, as well as the text itself, must be received on her authority alone.*

Such claims *we* cannot admit. . . . *In interpreting the language of Scripture, we proceed as we do in every other ancient document that has come down to us.* We employ all the aids that collateral and contemporary authorities supply . . . But there are extremes in all things: and this wise caution has ever been observed by all the men of light and reading in our Church. When, then, we say that 'the Church is the witness of Holy Writ,' we do not pledge ourselves to an implicit adoption of their *interpretations*, any more than in the former case we do to an unhesitating adoption of the *text*. . . . We do not part with our own right of judgment, though we pay due respect to their authority . . .

There is a large number of our brethren who maintain that Inspiration pervades

---

*voice of the Church*, to whom the Lord promised He would guide it into all truth?' —*Charge to the Clergy of Cape Town*, p.56.

* This, too, is maintained by Bishop GRAY in the *Church of South Africa*:—

'On the very same grounds we believe the Creed [he says afterwards 'the Creeds'] to be *the true interpretation of the Word* in all essential points. *It was framed by the Church under the same guidance*, vouchsafed in consequence of the same promises.'

'One step further I will go. The Creeds, *interpreted as the Church* (which drew them up under the Spirit's guidance) *intends them to be interpreted*, contain the whole Catholic Faith.'

'What the Catholic Church, while yet One, *during the first thousand years of her history*, under the Spirit's guidance in her great Councils, *declared to be, or received as, the true Faith, that is the true Faith*, and that we receive as such. More than this we are not bound to acknowledge: *less we may not*.'—*Charge to the Clergy of Natal*, p.34,35.

the whole of that volume [the Bible],—that it is equally in all and every part,—that, no matter who may be the writers, no matter what the subject, all alike issues from the teaching of the Holy Spirit, . . . all alike equally bears the stamp of Divine Inspiration, all alike is guarded from the possibility of error, even in the minutest details, by the presence and prompting of the Divine Spirit;* . . . and no subsequent discovery, whether in history, chronology, and physical science, or any other department of human knowledge, can be admitted for a moment, if at variance with the Inspired Records either in their literal or presumed meaning. No exception, no qualification, is admitted. One of the most recent and eminent advocates of this opinion puts it forward in the following words, too full and emphatic to admit of any,—'The Bible is none other than the voice of Him who sitteth upon the throne: every book of it, every chapter of it, every word of it, every syllable of it, every letter of it, is the direct utterance of the Most High' . .

It is an opinion, I candidly own, I cannot subscribe to. Nay, I apprehend that, as in other cases we may lose what we are justly entitled to claim by asking too much, so it may be here. In saying this, I have no mean authorities at my side. The venerable HOOKER's words are:—

'As incredible praises given unto men frequently abate and impair the credit of their deserved commendation, *we must likewise take care lest, in attributing to Scripture more than it contains, the incredibility of that may cause even those things which it hath to be less reverently esteemed.*'

And again Bishop BURNET in his discussions, Art. VI, has these words:—

'The laying down a scheme that asserts an immediate inspiration, which goes to the style and every tittle, though it may seem on the one hand to raise the honour of the Scriptures highly, lies open on the other hand to great difficulties, which seem inseparable from such an hypothesis; whereas a middle way, *as it maintains the Divine Inspiration in all that for which alone we can conceive Inspiration given*, helps us out of these difficulties by yielding that which serves to answer them, without weakening the authority of the whole.'

To these wise words I heartily subscribe my assent. But, without calling in the aid of such authorities, I must maintain that, when a claim of such magnitude is put forward, the *onus probandi* rests with those who maintain it. Vehemence of assertion will not suffice. It will not do to say, 'The Temple of the Lord are we!'—to say, 'Let the irreverent hand, that would touch one stone, beware lest in its fall it may grind him to powder.'

---

* I need hardly say that this is another dogma, which Bishop GRAY wishes to enforce upon the clergy in the *Church of South Africa.*

'The Church regards, and expects all its officers to regard, the Holy Scriptures as teaching *pure and simple truth.* It is nothing to reply that they teach what is true in all things necessary to salvation.'—*Trial, p.*390.

But it is said, 'Is it consistent with our notions of a God of Truth and Mercy to suppose that He would lay such a stumbling-block in our way, as to commit the sacred oracles to men, who would speak anything but what the Lord had put into their mouths, or mix up unimportant details with the words of Eternal Life?'

To this objection an answer is, in my mind, supplied by . . . the great and original BUTLER. . . . He shows *our incapacity of judging what was to be expected in a Revelation*, and, further, *the credibility from Analogy, that it might be attended with circumstances liable to objection.*

The words which I have above italicised give at once the reply to Bishop BROWNE's reasoning, when he says, *p.*13,14—'*We can never suppose*'—'*Think whether it is conceivable*'—'*Is it conceivable?*'—'*It seems utterly impossible—incredible*'—'*How can we believe?*' &c. We have nothing to do with our own *à priori* 'conceptions.' If the facts plainly show—as they undoubtedly do—that Moses was not the author of the Pentateuch, we must accept this result, and modify our views, as to what was probable or possible, accordingly.

The recent decision of the Privy Council has left me free to speak the truth to my Flock, as GOD has given me to see it, without let or hindrance on the part of the Metropolitan, though subject still to the control of Her Majesty in Council, to whom we are both amenable for any violation of the trust committed to us. Bishop GRAY, however, in his recent Charge to the Clergy of Capetown, has expressed himself as follows, *p.*18:—

With regard to Bishops [in the colonies], there are two documents, which contain the terms of their contract—the *Letters Patent* and the *Consecration Service.*

I. Now, with regard to the former, they are clearly framed upon the understanding that the 'doctrine and discipline of the United Church of England and Ireland,' the 'forms and usages' of the same, the 'rites and Liturgy of the Church of England,' will be maintained by them. But there is no positive statement that this is to be the case. And I confess that I entertain some doubt and apprehension whether I could, under the terms of the *Letters Patent*, and looking at the *actual practice and proceedings* of the Churches of our Communion out of England, compel a Suffragan of this Province to abide by the forms and usages, the rites and Liturgy, of the Church of England, if he chose to depart from them, either in the public worship of the Church, or—in what is of still greater moment—the Ordina-

tion of Priests to minister to the Flock of Christ. Those forms and usages *have*, we know, in the case of what is called the Jerusalem Bishopric, been departed from. In that case it was distinctly understood that acceptance of the Thirty-Nine Articles was not to be a necessary qualification for admission to Holy Orders.* . . .

II. But, if the Letters Patent should fail to bind a Bishop to the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England, would not *the engagements* which he enters into *at his Consecration* do this? Dr. COLENSO . . . thinks that they would. . . . He regards himself as a Bishop of the National Church, under the government of the laws provided for the government of the Establishment in England, to be administered by the Court of Appeal created by those laws for the Establishment.† *His avowed understanding, as to the terms upon which he accepted his office, marks out very clearly the extent of his own moral, and, perhaps, legal obligations.* . . . He appears to think that Colonial Bishops signify their assent at their Consecration to the Canons of 1603, and that by them, as well as by the oath of the Queen's Sovereignty then taken, they submit themselves to the whole Ecclesiastical System

---

* Bishop GRAY himself, as I conceive, has set an example of departing from the *doctrine* and the *discipline* of the Church of England, in attempting to depose a Bishop for saying what any Deacon would have the most perfect right and liberty to say in any Parish Church in England. And, as to departing from the 'forms and usages,' it would surely be a mockery to require a native candidate for Orders to sign his adherence to the 'Thirty-Nine Articles' or to the 'Athanasian Creed,' which it is utterly impossible to translate into his language, or to use in the congregation a mere *travesty* of the grand English Liturgy,—for such must be any attempt to convey literally into the tongue of a barbarous people the majestic phrases of our Prayer-Book, the result of centuries of high culture, and existing in a language which combines the force and power of expression of a number of others.

† Bishop GRAY has repeatedly stated or implied that in my recent proceedings I have regarded the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as the 'Court of Appeal' for the Colonial Church. But this is a mistake. I regard myself, while holding the Queen's Letters Patent, as being under the protection of Her Majesty; and I appealed to Her for that protection against the proceedings of an episcopal Brother, who also held Letters Patent from the Crown, and professed to act under their authority. If Bishop GRAY had resigned his Patent, I should have had no reason for appealing directly to the Crown against his conduct, however injurious or arbitrary. But then I should not have needed to do so. The whole strength of his position arose from the fact that he professed to act with authority derived from the Crown, to which loyal subjects would naturally wish to pay all due respect. I appealed, then, to the *Queen* Herself against the proceedings of her Patentee, and *not* to the Judicial Committee; and Her Majesty was pleased to refer the matter for advice to the Judicial Committee.

as at present prevailing in England. But this is a mistake. They do not subscribe to the Canons of 1603, or to any of them. . . . *The Canons of* 1603, *then, have no bearing upon a Colonial Bishop. He does not contract anything with regard to them.**

III. Nor does the oath of the Queen's Sovereignty, taken at Consecration, which is of a very general character,—which has no special reference to ecclesiastical affairs,—which is taken by the Laity as well as the Clergy, by those filling various secular offices under the Crown,—help much in the matter. It cannot be construed as binding those who take it in any special way to the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England. . . .

IV. The Bishop's *only contract with the Church at his Consecration* is—

'To teach or maintain nothing, as required of necessity of eternal salvation, but that which he shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Holy Scriptures,'—

'Faithfully to exercise himself in the same Holy Scriptures, and call upon God in prayer for the true understanding of the same,'—

'To be ready to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine, contrary to God's Word, and, both privately and openly, to call upon and encourage others to do the same,'—

'To correct and punish such as be unquiet, disobedient, and criminous within his Diocese, according to such authority as he has by God's Word, and as shall be committed to him by the Ordinance of this Realm,'—

'To be faithful in ordaining, sending, or laying hands upon others.'

V. These are the pledges which he gives to the Church, and he crowns all by the oath of due or canonical obedience, by which he binds himself to such submission as the Canons [of the United Church of England and Ireland, which are all the Canons we have to do with,] require him to yield to his Metropolitan.

Now there is nothing in all this which expressly binds a Bishop of the Colonial Church to the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England. There seems to be nothing in the pledges which he gives to prevent him, if he be so minded,

---

* Most of the Canons of 1603, as is well known, are become a mere dead-letter, and are violated systematically in England. Yet in a loose way they are still supposed to be binding—at least, *in foro conscientiæ*—on the Clergy of the Church of England. To that extent, while I hold the Letters Patent, I consider myself, and the Bishop of Capetown also, to be 'morally and, perhaps, legally,' bound. And whenever Her Majesty shall be advised that I have so far transgressed the letter and spirit of these Canons, as to deserve to have my Patent cancelled,—as it seems to me Bishop Gray is doing, as regards the 2nd, 36th, and 37th Canons, by the course which he has taken, and still threatens to take, in defiance of the Royal Authority,—I shall cheerfully submit to such a judgment as constitutionally right and just.

from discarding the Liturgy, the Articles, the Creeds, from his Diocese. . . . It may be said, indeed, that a pledge to do this is implied in the act of Consecration,—in the acceptance of the office of a Bishop at the hands of Bishops of the Church of England. Morally, I think this is so. But the consecration of Bishops for America, for heathen lands, and for congregations at Jerusalem, by the same service, might be pleaded as a reason for not construing the contract too strictly. And the various circumstances of countries, climates, peoples, would be urged as furnishing grounds for sanctioning alterations, deemed almost necessary, in the worship and formularies of the Church.—*Charge to the Clergy of Capetown*, Jan. 17, 1865, *p.*18–24.

And the Bishop asks—'What, then, is to bind us together in one?' His answer is, a series of 'graduated Synods'!

It is through means of graduated Synods,—*Diocesan*, *Provincial*, *National*, each in their due order and subordination, the lower submitting to the higher, and all deferring to those *General* Synods, whose authority has been recognised by the Mother Church in her Book of Homilies and by the State in its Acts of Parliament (1 Eliz. cap. 1),—that unity can alone be maintained amongst the several branches of our Church throughout the world. . . . It is the wish of Convocation, that *all Bishops from the Empire, with representatives from the other orders of the Church, if it be thought fit, shall constitute the National Synod*, whose authority shall be inferior only to that of General Councils, and whose decisions shall bind both the Provincial and Diocesan Synods!'

Could anything be more hopeless? We have only to imagine the colonial bishops dragged from all the ends of the earth—nay, clergy and laity also, as 'representatives of the other Orders of the Church,' not, however, as having any *right* to be summoned, but only '*if it be thought fit*,'—from New Zealand, South Africa, West Australia, Victoria—making wearisome journeys and voyages of many months, at a ruinous expense, leaving their families, and their *work*, behind them,—in order to meet in London some English and Irish Bishops, and after long discussions arrive at conclusions, from which many of them will wholly dissent, and which great numbers of their Flocks may equally refuse to recognise, unless compelled by the fear of the 'greater excommunication'! Suppose, for instance, such a

question as that of 'Endless Punishment,' or the 'Infallibility of the Bible,' discussed in such a 'National Synod,' and decided as the Bishop of Capetown, and probably many others of the Bishops of the present day, might desire. Would such a decision bind the Bishops of Rupert's Land or Labuan, who could not be present from the Red River or Borneo in time to take part in the discussion? Would it bind those who could not *afford* to be present—who could not incur the expense of money or of time—who could not abandon more pressing duties? And what of our Flocks? Is it not plain that any Bishop, or any Body, who could seriously sanction and set forth such a proposition, has totally mistaken the temper of Englishmen, and the spirit of the age we live in? The time is surely gone by for indulging even the dream of a measure like this being ever attempted with any hope of success. And a Metropolitan may become securely a heretic or schismatic to any extent, without fear of interruption to his plans, if the only remedy for his offence lies, as Sir R. PHILLIMORE lately suggested before the Privy Council on behalf of the Bishop of Capetown, in an appeal to a 'General Council!'

But the case would be very little mended if an attempt were made to carry out a *Provincial* Council—at least, in South Africa. Imagine one or two Clergy of Natal, and a few enterprising planters or busy merchants, embarking for a stormy voyage of 700 or 800 miles to attend a 'Synod' at Capetown —leaving their plantations to be mismanaged, their stores in the hands of their clerks, their wives and families and servants to take care of themselves: and for what purpose?—to meet an overwhelming number of the Laity and Clergy of Capetown or Grahamstown, who, having no such difficulties to encounter, no such risks to run, would be sure to be present in their places,

—the *Clergy*, at all events,—be the weather fair or foul. Who does not see that the Laity and Clergy of Natal could not possibly be expected to attend under such circumstances? or that, if any did, they would not include the influential laymen, the men of mark in the community, but inferior substitutes, who would not in any way represent the whole body of the laity, or secure any weight to their decisions? There is no Imperial Chest to pay expenses in these days: and assuredly the colonists themselves would be very little likely to contribute funds for such perfectly unprofitable purposes.

But, if anything more were needed in these days to show us the utter futility of all attempts to suppress free thought and free utterance in the Church of England by penalties and legal enactments, it has been supplied abundantly by the recent charge of the Ven. Archdeacon (SINCLAIR) of Middlesex, in which he has reduced the whole process of ecclesiastical prosecutions for heresy *ad absurdum*. For the Archdeacon's argument very plainly shows that while a simple-minded, honest, enthusiast, who will not retract or explain away his words, may be caught in the legal meshes, because he has unfortunately used some expression which directly contradicts an article or formulary, yet another clergyman, who has expressed himself more cautiously, so as to avoid such collision, may teach downright irreligion and atheism, if he will, and snap his fingers in defiance at all the Ecclesiastical Courts of the Realm. Archdeacon SINCLAIR, in fact, has only made more plain—what, indeed, was well known before—that the principles of English legislation do not allow of laws being framed so as to satisfy the demands of bigotry and superstition. It will always be possible for any clergyman to go in and out *between the posts* of the enclosure, and find free pasture for himself and for his flock,

provided only that he does not run his head just exactly against one of the posts themselves,—unless, indeed, it has become sufficiently decayed already, to fall almost by its own weight. Surely, the only effectual method of performing the vow, which as Bishops we have made at consecration, *viz.*—

'To be ready *to banish* and *drive away* all erroneous and strange doctrine, contrary to God's Word,'—

is by *preaching the truth*,—enforcing it by reasonable argument, and confirming it by a holy life, and, above all, by the exercise of Christian candour and charity towards those who differ—

'speaking the truth in love,'—'in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves,'—'by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.'

'What, then, is to bind us together in one?'

Perhaps, we may fall back at last upon the Divine Method of securing unity. We may begin to put our trust in God, the Living God, the God of Truth, instead of in 'graduated Synods, diocesan, provincial, national,' 'coercive jurisdiction,' and temporal or spiritual penalties. To that Power our Lord appealed by prayer, and not to the miserable arm of flesh:—

'Holy FATHER, keep through Thine own Name those whom Thou hast given me, that they may be one as we!'

Perhaps, we may not only profess to 'believe in God,' when we say the Creed, but really believe in Him—believe that He Himself is present in the world which He has made—is present in human hearts and in human history, as present now as He was in the days of old, when Prophets and Apostles and the Son of Man Himself declared 'His glad tidings of great joy which should be for all people.' We may believe that He is really by His Spirit educating the human race in the fuller, clearer knowledge of Himself, revealing to them His Name, teaching them

more and more of His Truth, and that He Himself is willing, and able as He is willing, to protect His own.

*Securus judicat Orbis Terrarum!* It is a word of mighty meaning this, which a great writer of the present day has set before us, as the strength and solace of his mind in a time of trial. But it is a word which, as it seems to me, reaches far beyond the meaning which that writer himself has given to it. 'What all men everywhere feel to be true, must needs be true—substantially true—for all.' When God by His Spirit has quickened the hearts of men all over the world, as He has done in this our day,—has vastly increased the intellectual light which shines around us,—has made the different sciences give up their stores of treasure to a multitude of enquirers,—has led the greatest thinkers to perceive that many popular religious notions are contradicted by the facts thus disclosed,—and, contemporaneously with this, has stirred deep questionings within the minds of others, which have taught them to see, and to point out to their brethren, that these popular religious notions *are not truths*, are not of the *essence of religion*, may be dismissed, as *popular errors*, without for a moment shaking our trust in God for this life, or our hopes for eternity,—when all this is taking place not in England only, but among earnest and devout men in almost every Christian country of the world,—we may surely say, *Securus judicat Orbis Terrarum!* and go on calmly and confidently in the belief that the Living God Himself is with us,—that the Work and the Power are His, and we cannot gainsay, we cannot withstand it.

If, then, I am asked, 'What shall bind us together in one?' I answer, God Himself will do it in His own good time and way, by breathing into us more of the spirit of *Charity*, and infusing into us more of the love of *Truth* for the Truth's sake.

We shall then, while maintaining earnestly those views, which, on grounds which seem to us sufficient, we believe to be true, bear lovingly with those who differ from them, if only we perceive that they are living according to the light which they have, and following after GOD, as dear children. That wider views must be held in future on the subject of Scripture Inspiration and the Infallibility of the Bible, seems now to be pretty generally admitted. And, doubtless, other dogmatic statements, which have hitherto been received with a like unreasoning acquiescence, will have to be modified from time to time in accordance with advancing knowledge. It may be also that the very freedom from ecclesiastical domination, which is now assured to our colonial Bishops,—coupled with the fact, which Bishop GRAY admits while he laments it, that they are not bound to 'teach or maintain anything, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but what they shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Holy Scriptures,' or to require their clergy to do anything more than this,—may contribute to the progress of honest research and free enquiry, at home, as well as abroad. As Bishop of Natal, I am now at full liberty to continue and complete the laborious work in which I have been engaged, and to publish the results of my enquiries, — relieved from the intolerable yoke of absolute Church authority, but subject always to that of Her Majesty, the Queen, from whom I received my appointment, and from whom I may at any time, for just cause shown, receive my dismissal. But, if the Bishop is free, so also should be, and, as far as I am concerned, shall be, the clergy of Natal, to speak their honest convictions on these points, and instruct their people in such knowledge as they themselves have gained. They need not fear check or censure, because, for instance, they may

have explained to their Flocks how true religious lessons may be drawn from the Scripture accounts of the Creation, the Fall, and the Deluge, while yet they have taught them also, in private or in public, that the results of Modern Science—which *ought* to be familiar to the great body of their hearers—prove beyond all doubt that these accounts are not historically true.

On this subject some weighty words were spoken by Sir CHARLES LYELL, Bart., at the recent anniversary of the Geological Society of London, which I commend to the reader's attention. They were reported for me by a friend, and, having submitted them to the speaker's inspection, I am at liberty to state that they express correctly the substance of his address.

In the discussions which I have lately heard, on the propriety of certain writers having openly declared the modifications in their views, to which they had been led by new discoveries in Science, I have heard some able scholars of about my own age gravely declare that, while they highly approved of researches in Science and Biblical Criticism, and were interested in seeing the light which modern researches in physics, languages, ethnology, and antiquities, were shedding on the interpretation of Scripture, and while they were of opinion that questions arising out of these enquiries should be thought out and communicated to the learned, they yet regretted that they were not all published, as they would have been some four centuries ago, in the *Latin* language, so as to be confined to a circle which could be safely entrusted with such novelties, without there being any danger of unsettling the creed of the multitude.

I cannot help being amused when I try to imagine what would have been the sensations of these friends of mine, if they had happened casually to drop into the theatre in Jermyn Street, when Professor HUXLEY was lecturing on the origin of species and of the various races of mankind, or when Professor RAMSAY was giving the course of lectures, which he has just concluded, on geological time, and observed that these discourses, delivered gratis, or for a mere nominal fee, in a Government establishment, were addressed to the *working classes*, to a large, intelligent, and enthusiastic audience composed of the artisans of London,—that they were given not to a select few and in a dead language, but in the vulgar tongue, in good, impressive, clear, often eloquent, English,—what, I say, would have been the reflections of my friends upon the want of judgment shown by the teachers of the present generation, in freely communicating such knowledge to such a class of students.

But, if it were *possible* to limit the communication of new truths to a privileged class, you will, I am sure, agree with me that it is not *desirable* or *right* to do so, and that no state of society can be conceived more dangerous than one, in which the distance between the opinions of the educated few and the less educated millions is continually becoming wider and wider, in matters in which all must take the deepest interest.

There is, however, another step in advance, which it is high time for scientific laymen to take, if they would be true to themselves and to Science. It is not enough that they should themselves communicate freely to all the new truths at which they have arrived. They should lend their encouragement, sympathy, and support to those members of the Clergy, a body to whom the education of the millions is mainly entrusted, who boldly come forward to make known such truths as Science has established, even when they necessitate the modification of some of those theological and traditional opinions, in which we have all been brought up. They should admire and honour them for the sacrifices they are ready to make in their efforts to reform the popular views of Scripture, and to bring them into harmony with the conclusions deduced from scientific enquiry. Above all, they should protest against the doctrine of those who hold that, the moment any one of these teachers, *appointed by the Nation*, has acquired a clear knowledge of some of these new truths, he should resign his post, and give place to some other, who, being ignorant, could conscientiously go on teaching the old doctrines, or, *not* being ignorant, could reconcile it with his sense of duty to teach others what he does not believe himself.

I thus send forth my Fifth Part into the world, content with knowing that this volume contains *the most important portion of my Work*, so that if, in God's Providence, I should be prevented from completing it, I shall have at least carried it so far as to secure the main object of my labours, and shall have placed the composite character of Genesis, and of the Pentateuch generally—as well as the unhistorical nature of its narratives—fairly and fully before the eyes of English readers.

Most heartily and sincerely do I thank those many friends in England, of the Clergy and Laity, who have aided me in these trying times, publicly and privately, with counsel and comfort,—who have stood by me in the hour of conflict,—who have sustained me with kind words, and defended me by

generous deeds, the remembrance of which will never depart from me.

I now return to the duties which have been so long interrupted—of late, by circumstances not under my own control. In the midst of those duties, I shall find frequent opportunity for acting on the principles which I have here enunciated, and shall rejoice in breathing myself, and helping others to breathe, the fresh, free air, which the recent decisions have made it now possible to breathe within the bounds of the National Church. I shall also, as I hope and fully purpose, find time to pursue these enquiries, and, perhaps, hereafter return to publish them. But all these things are in the hands of God. Should I never return, I bid my friends in England farewell, to meet them again, I trust, on another shore. But, if I should return, a few years hence, it is my firm belief that, as we are now all thoroughly ashamed of those trials and executions for witchcraft and sorcery, (so strikingly and painfully depicted in Mr. LECKY'S noble work, *The Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe*,) which disgraced the Christianity of our forefathers in the Middle Ages, nay, even down to much later days,—in which even good men and true, the pious and the learned, took their part, reviling, persecuting, drowning, burning, for the love of Christ and of the souls of men, the innocent victims of religious fanaticism,*—so. I shall find in that day my fellow-

* Happily, in England much greater moderation seems to have been exercised in the actual treatment of cases of witchcraft, than in most other countries. Mr, LECKY says, I.*p.*134:—'In reviewing the history of witchcraft in England, it is impossible to avoid observing the singularly favourable contrast which the Anglican Church presents, both to continental Catholicism and to Puritanism. It is, indeed, true that her Bishops contributed much to the enactments of the laws against witchcraft,—that the immense majority of the Clergy firmly believed in the reality of the crime,—and that they continued to assert and to defend it, when the great bulk of educated laymen had abandoned it. It is also true that the scepticism on

Countrymen and fellow-Churchmen ashamed of that religious fear and frenzy, which has raged so furiously in these our times, —ashamed of the violence with which they have maintained, in opposition to the plainest evidence of reason, the time-honoured traditions of former ages,—ashamed of the attempt to bear down and crush under the weight of opprobrious names, and silence by arbitrary measures, fitted only for the dark ages of ecclesiastical despotism, honest and earnest endeavours, on the part of myself and others among the Clergy, to relieve the religious teaching of the National Church from the reproach of being contradictory to the plain conclusions of Science, and far behind the progress of the age. Nay, I am not without hope that some even of those, who have been most severe upon me, may learn meanwhile to entertain a kinder feeling, and come to see that, however unworthily, I have yet according to my light been labouring, as earnestly as they, to sow the seed of Life Eternal, and do the work to which my God has called me,—and so may give to me again the right hand of fellowship, which they have now withheld, as a fellow-labourer with them for the Kingdom of God.

J. W. NATAL.

LONDON: *June* 3, 1865.

the subject of witches arose among those who were least governed by the Church, advanced with the decline of the influence of the Clergy, and was commonly branded as a phase and manifestation of Infidelity. Yet, on the other hand, it is impossible to deny that the general moderation of the higher Clergy was beyond all praise, and that even those who were most credulous were singularly free from that thirst for blood which was elsewhere so common.'

# CONTENTS.


| CHAP. | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| | PREFACE | v—xlvi |
| I. | THE DEUTERONOMISTIC PORTIONS OF THE BOOK OF JOSHUA. | 3—11 |
| II. | THE ELOHISTIC PORTIONS OF GENESIS. | 12—17 |
| III. | CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ELOHISTIC PORTIONS OF GENESIS | 18—22 |
| IV. | CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NON-ELOHISTIC PORTIONS OF GENESIS | 23—32 |
| V. | DIFFERENCES AND DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE ELOHISTIC AND NON-ELOHISTIC PORTIONS OF GENESIS | 33—47 |
| VI. | THE SECOND JEHOVIST AND DEUTERONOMIST | 48—57 |
| VII. | THE SECOND ELOHIST AND JEHOVIST | 58—68 |
| VIII. | THE AGE OF THE ELOHIST | 69—81 |
| IX. | THE AGE OF THE ELOHIST—*continued* | 82—92 |
| X. | THE AGE OF THE JEHOVIST | 93—106 |
| XI. | THE AGE OF THE JEHOVIST—*continued* | 107—120 |
| XII. | JACOB'S BLESSING ON JUDAH | 121—131 |
| XIII. | JACOB'S BLESSING ON JOSEPH, REUBEN, ETC. | 132—144 |
| XIV. | JACOB'S BLESSING ON LEVI | 145—158 |
| XV. | THE LEVITES IN THE TIME OF DAVID | 159—177 |
| XVI. | SUMMARY OF THE PRECEDING CONCLUSIONS AS TO THE AGES OF THE DIFFERENT WRITERS OF GENESIS | 178—196 |
| XVII. | THE COMPLETE ELOHISTIC NARRATIVE IN GENESIS | 197—211 |
| XVIII. | THE SUCCESSIVE ADDITIONS TO THE ELOHISTIC NARRATIVE IN GENESIS | 212—268 |
| XIX. | THE PHŒNICIAN ORIGIN OF THE NAME JEHOVAH | 269—284 |
| XX. | THE CORRUPT WORSHIP OF JEHOVAH IN ISRAEL | 285—295 |
| XXI. | THE EFFORTS TO REFORM THE WORSHIP OF JEHOVAH IN ISRAEL | 296—306 |
| XXII. | CONCLUDING REMARKS. | 307—320 |
| | CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS | 1—261 |
| APP. | | |
| I. | THE ISRAELITISH ORIGIN OF THE ANCIENT WORSHIP OF MECCA | 265—278 |
| II. | THE ELOHISTIC AND JEHOVISTIC PSALMS CONSIDERED WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE REMARKS OF THE REV. J. J. S. PEROWNE AND THE BISHOP (HAROLD BROWNE) OF ELY | 279—304 |
| III. | ON THE NAME JAO, FROM MOVERS'S PHÖNIZIE | 305—320 |

SUPERSTITION, IN ALL TIMES AND AMONG ALL NATIONS, IS THE FEAR OF A SPIRIT WHOSE PASSIONS ARE THOSE OF A MAN, WHOSE ACTS ARE THE ACTS OF A MAN; WHO IS PRESENT IN SOME PLACES, NOT IN OTHERS; WHO MAKES SOME PLACES HOLY, AND NOT OTHERS; WHO IS KIND TO ONE PERSON, UNKIND TO ANOTHER; WHO IS PLEASED OR ANGRY, ACCORDING TO THE DEGREE OF ATTENTION YOU PAY TO HIM OR PRAISE YOU REFUSE TO HIM; WHO IS HOSTILE GENERALLY TO HUMAN PLEASURE, BUT MAY BE BRIBED BY SACRIFICE OF A PART OF THAT PLEASURE INTO PERMITTING THE REST. THIS, WHATEVER FORM OF FAITH IT COLOURS, IS THE CAUSE OF SUPERSTITION.

AND RELIGION IS THE BELIEF IN A SPIRIT WHOSE MERCIES ARE OVER ALL HIS WORKS,—WHO IS KIND EVEN TO THE UNTHANKFUL AND THE EVIL; WHO IS EVERYWHERE PRESENT, AND THEREFORE IS IN NO PLACE TO BE SOUGHT, AND IN NO PLACE TO BE EVADED; TO WHOM ALL CREATURES, TIMES, AND THINGS ARE EVERLASTINGLY HOLY, AND WHO CLAIMS—NOT TITHES OF WEALTH, NOR SEVENTHS OF DAYS—BUT ALL THE WEALTH THAT WE HAVE, AND ALL THE DAYS THAT WE LIVE, AND ALL THE BEINGS THAT WE ARE,—BUT WHO CLAIMS THAT TOTALITY BECAUSE HE DELIGHTS ONLY IN THE DELIGHT OF HIS CREATURES, AND BECAUSE THEREFORE, THE ONE DUTY THAT THEY OWE TO HIM, AND THE ONLY SERVICE THEY CAN RENDER HIM, IS TO BE HAPPY;—A SPIRIT, THEREFORE, WHOSE ETERNAL BENEVOLENCE CANNOT BE ANGERED, CANNOT BE APPEASED; WHOSE LAWS ARE EVERLASTING AND INEXORABLE, SO THAT HEAVEN AND EARTH MUST INDEED PASS AWAY IF ONE JOT OF THEM FAILED,—LAWS WHICH ATTACH TO EVERY WRONG AND ERROR A MEASURED, INEVITABLE PENALTY, TO EVERY RIGHTNESS AND PRUDENCE, AN ASSURED REWARD,—PENALTY, OF WHICH THE REMITTANCE CANNOT BE PURCHASED, AND REWARD, OF WHICH THE PROMISE CANNOT BE BROKEN.—RUSKIN, *Royal Institute of British Architects, Sessional Papers*, 1864-5, *p.* 143.

# THE BOOK OF GENESIS

## ANALYSED AND SEPARATED,

## AND THE AGES OF ITS WRITERS DETERMINED.

SUPERSTITION, IN ALL TIMES AND AMONG ALL NATIONS, IS THE FEAR OF A SPIRIT WHOSE PASSIONS ARE THOSE OF A MAN, WHOSE ACTS ARE THE ACTS OF A MAN; WHO IS PRESENT IN SOME PLACES, NOT IN OTHERS; WHO MAKES SOME PLACES HOLY, AND NOT OTHERS; WHO IS KIND TO ONE PERSON, UNKIND TO ANOTHER; WHO IS PLEASED OR ANGRY, ACCORDING TO THE DEGREE OF ATTENTION YOU PAY TO HIM OR PRAISE YOU REFUSE TO HIM; WHO IS HOSTILE GENERALLY TO HUMAN PLEASURE, BUT MAY BE BRIBED BY SACRIFICE OF A PART OF THAT PLEASURE INTO PERMITTING THE REST. THIS, WHATEVER FORM OF FAITH IT COLOURS, IS THE CAUSE OF SUPERSTITION.

AND RELIGION IS THE BELIEF IN A SPIRIT WHOSE MERCIES ARE OVER ALL HIS WORKS,—WHO IS KIND EVEN TO THE UNTHANKFUL AND THE EVIL; WHO IS EVERYWHERE PRESENT, AND THEREFORE IS IN NO PLACE TO BE SOUGHT, AND IN NO PLACE TO BE EVADED; TO WHOM ALL CREATURES, TIMES, AND THINGS ARE EVERLASTINGLY HOLY, AND WHO CLAIMS—NOT TITHES OF WEALTH, NOR SEVENTHS OF DAYS—BUT ALL THE WEALTH THAT WE HAVE, AND ALL THE DAYS THAT WE LIVE, AND ALL THE BEINGS THAT WE ARE,—BUT WHO CLAIMS THAT TOTALITY BECAUSE HE DELIGHTS ONLY IN THE DELIGHT OF HIS CREATURES, AND BECAUSE THEREFORE, THE ONE DUTY THAT THEY OWE TO HIM, AND THE ONLY SERVICE THEY CAN RENDER HIM, IS TO BE HAPPY;—A SPIRIT, THEREFORE, WHOSE ETERNAL BENEVOLENCE CANNOT BE ANGERED, CANNOT BE APPEASED; WHOSE LAWS ARE EVERLASTING AND INEXORABLE, SO THAT HEAVEN AND EARTH MUST INDEED PASS AWAY IF ONE JOT OF THEM FAILED,—LAWS WHICH ATTACH TO EVERY WRONG AND ERROR A MEASURED, INEVITABLE PENALTY, TO EVERY RIGHTNESS AND PRUDENCE, AN ASSURED REWARD,—PENALTY, OF WHICH THE REMITTANCE CANNOT BE PURCHASED, AND REWARD, OF WHICH THE PROMISE CANNOT BE BROKEN.—RUSKIN, *Royal Institute of British Architects, Sessional Papers*, 1864-5, *p.* 143.

# THE BOOK OF GENESIS

## ANALYSED AND SEPARATED,

## AND THE AGES OF ITS WRITERS DETERMINED.

# CHAPTER I.

## THE DEUTERONOMISTIC PORTIONS OF THE BOOK OF JOSHUA.

1. In Part III I have endeavoured to determine approximately the age in which the Book of Deuteronomy was written; and I have given fully the evidence, which has led me to the conclusion, as stated in (862.ix), that the date of the composition of this Book is to be set—

either in the latter part of Manasseh's reign, or in the early part of Josiah's.

I am disposed to place it myself in the early years of Josiah's reign, $\pm 630$ B.C., for reasons which I have stated at length in Part III; and this is the view maintained by De Wette, Von Bohlen, and Knobel. But Ewald, Riehm, Bleek, Kuenen, &c. are of opinion that it may have been written in the latter part of his grandfather's reign. As I have said, (III.863),—

The difference in this point of detail is, of course, inconsiderable, and of no importance whatever with reference to the main question, as to this Book having been written, or not, by Moses himself. The above able critics may vary within a limit of thirty or forty years, in fixing the precise date of its composition. But they are all agreed in assigning it to the same later period of Jewish History. And *this, indeed, may be ranked among the most certain results of modern scientific Biblical Criticism.*

2. But it is of so much consequence to our future discussions, and will clear the way so much for our further enquiries, that the reader should be entirely satisfied upon this important point of the *non-Mosaic* origin of Deuteronomy, that it may be well to show here, before we proceed, that a large portion of

the Book of Joshua is also due to the Deuteronomist,—who must, consequently, have lived, at all events, after the days of Moses, since the death and burial of Moses are recorded in D.xxxiv. This appears from the style and language of considerable portions of Joshua being identical with those of Deuteronomy, as will be seen in the following instances.

3. *Expressions common to Deuteronomy and Joshua, but occurring nowhere else in the Pentateuch.*

(i) 'there shall not a man stand before thee,' D.vii.24, Jo.i.5.

(ii) 'He will be with thee, He will not fail thee nor forsake thee,' D.xxxi.8; *comp.* 'I will be with thee, I will not fail thee nor forsake thee,' Jo.i.5.

(iii) 'be strong and of a good courage,' D.xxxi.6,7,23, Jo.i.6,7,9,18, x.25.

(iv) הִנְחִיל, *hinkhil*, 'make to inherit,' D.i.38,iii.28,xii.10,xix.3,xxi.16,xxxi.7, xxxii.8, Jo.i.6.

(v) 'observe to do,' D.v.1,29,vi.3,25,vii.11,viii.1,xi.22,32,xii.1,32,xv.5,xvii.10,19, xix.9,xxiv.8,xxviii.1,15,58,xxxi.12,xxxii.46, Jo.i.7,8,xxii.5, *comp.* xxiii.6.

(vi) 'depart (סוּר, *sur*) to the right hand and to the left,' D.ii.27, v.29(32), xvii.11,20, xxviii.14, Jo.i.7, xxiii.6.

N.B. The verb is different in G.xxiv.49, N.xx.17, xxii.26.

(vii) הַתּוֹרָה, *hattorah*, 'the Law,' used of the whole Law, D.i.5, iv.8,44, xvii. 11,18,19, xxvii.3,8,26, xxviii.58,61, xxix.20,28, xxx.10, xxxi.9,11,12,24,26, xxxii.46, xxxiii.4,10, Jo.i.7,8, viii.31,32,34,34, xxii.5, xxiii.6, xxiv.26.

(viii) 'written in this Book (in the Book of this Law, &c.),' D.xxviii.58,61, xxix.20,21,27, xxx.10, Jo.i.8, viii.31,34, xxiii.6.

(ix) 'be not afraid (fear not), neither be terrified,' D.i.21,29, xxxi.6,8, Jo.i.9, viii.1, x.25.

(x) 'go in to possess,' D.iv.5,vi.1,vii.1,ix.1,4,5,x.11,xi.8,10,11,29,31,xii.29,xxiii.20, xxviii.21,63, xxx.16, Jo.i.11, xviii.3.

(xi) יְרֻשָּׁה, *yĕrushshah*, 'possession,' D.ii.5,9,9,12,19,19, iii.20, Jo.i.15, xii.6,7.

(xii) "the heart melting,' D.i.28, xx.8, Jo.ii.11, v.1, vii.5.

(xiii) 'Jehovah, He is the Elohim, in the heaven above and on the earth beneath,' D.iv.39, Jo.ii.11.

(xiv) 'the Priests the Levites (sons of Levi),' D.xvii.9,18, xviii.1, xxi.5, xxiv.8, xxvii.9, xxxi.9, Jo.iii.3, viii.33.

(xv) 'the Priests, bearers of the Ark,' D.x.8, xxxi.9,25, Jo.iii.6,8,13,14,17, iv.9,10,16*,18, vi.6,12, viii.33.

(xvi) אוֹצָר, *otsar*, 'treasure,' D.xxviii.12, xxxii.34, Jo.vi.19,24.

(xvii) הַשְׁמִיד, *hishmid*, 'destroy,' used of destroying *people*, D.i.27, ii.12,21, 22,23, iv.3, vi.15, vii.4,24, ix.3,8,14,19,20,25, xxviii.48,63, xxxi.3,4, Jo.vii.12, ix.24, xi.14,20, xxiii.15, xxiv.8.

(xviii) 'judges and officers,' D.xvi.18, Jo.viii.33, xxiii.2, xxiv.1.

(xix) 'blessing and cursing,' D.xi.26, xxx.1,19, Jo.viii.34.

(xx) 'the place which He (Jehovah) will choose,' D.xii.5,11,14,18,21,26, xiv. 23,24,25, xv.20, xvi.2,6,7,11,15,16, xvii.8,10, xviii.6, xxvi.2, xxxi.11, Jo.ix.27$^{b}$.

(xxi) 'set before the face'='deliver up' an enemy, their land, &c. D.i.8,21, ii.31,33,36, vii.2,23, xxiii.14, xxxi.5, Jo.x.12, xi.6.

(xxii) Jehovah 'fighting for' Israel, D.iii.22, Jo.x.14,42, xxiii.3,10.

(xxiii) 'every breath,' D.xx.16, Jo.x.40, xi.11,14.

(xxiv) 'give as an inheritance,' used of the land of Canaan, D.iv.21,38, xv.4, xix.10, xx.16, xxi.23, xxiv.4, xxv.19, xxvi.1, Jo.xi.23, xiii.6,7.

(xxv) 'that shall be in those days,' D.xvii.9, xix.17, xxvi.3, Jo.xx.6$^{b}$.

(xxvi) 'with all the heart and with all the soul,' D.iv.29, vi.5, x.12, xi.13, xiii.3, xxvi.16, xxx.2,6,10, Jo.xxii.5, xxiii.14.

(xxvii) 'walk in the ways of Jehovah,' D.v.30(33), viii.6, x.12, xi.22, xix.9, xxvi.17, xxviii.9, xxx.16, Jo.xxii.5.

(xxviii) 'take good heed (to your souls),' D.ii.4,iv.9,15,xxiv.8,Jo.xxii.5,xxiii.11.

(xxix) 'Jehovah, Elohim of Elohim,' D.x.17, Jo.xxii.22.

(xxx) 'cleave to Jehovah,' D.iv.4, x.20, xi.22, xiii.4, xxx.20, Jo.xxiii.8.

(xxxi) 'to dispossess nations great and mighty . . . from before thee,' D.iv.38 ; *comp.* 'shall dispossess from before you nations great and mighty,' Jo.xxiii.9.

(xxxii) '*good* is the *land* (the *good land*) which Jehovah our Elohim is giving (has given) to us,' &c. D.i.25, iv.21, viii.10, ix.6, xi.17, Jo.xxiii.13,15,16.

(xxxiii) 'to give thee great and goodly cities, which thou buildedst not, . . . vineyards and olive-trees, which thou plantedst not,' D.vi.10,11 ;

*comp.* 'I have given you . . . cities which ye builded not, . . .. vineyards and olive-trees which ye planted not,' Jo.xxiv.13.

(xxxiv) 'forsake Jehovah (His covenant),' D.xxviii.20, xxix.25, xxxi.16, Jo.xxiv.20.

N.B. The phrase 'Jehovah thy (our &c.) Elohim,' which occurs so frequently (307 times) in Deuteronomy (III.554), occurs also freely (39 times) in some parts of Joshua, *viz.* Jo.i.9,11,13,15,17, ii.11, iii.3,9, iv.5,23,23,24, viii.7, ix.9,24, x.19, xiv.8,9, xviii.6, xxii.3,4,5,19,29, xxiii.3,3,5,5,8,10,11,13,14,15,15,16, xxiv.17,18,24. But this cannot be regarded as a certain indication of the hand of the Deuteronomist, since the expression is also found, though rarely by comparison, in the other four Books of the Pentateuch. We shall, therefore, take no account of it here.

4. The above Table exhibits only some of the more prominent examples of the identity of phraseology which is found to exist between Deuteronomy and parts of the Book of Joshua: and the reader will observe that *not one of the above formulæ occurs even once in any of the other four Books of the Pentateuch.* It might, perhaps, be suggested, in support of the traditionary view, that, if Deuteronomy had been already written by Moses, the writer of Joshua might have so thoroughly studied it, as to

have become imbued, as it were, with its tone of thought, and addicted to its style of expression, and so might naturally fall into the use of the very same formulæ. This supposition would be, indeed, very extravagant, when applied to such a number of formulæ, and of such great variety, as those above enumerated. But it is at once set aside when it is observed that these Deuteronomistic formulæ do not occur throughout the *whole* Book of Joshua, but only in certain portions of it, and that in the remaining parts of the Book, in which we find none of these formulæ, we meet again with the peculiar phrases of the older writers of the Pentateuch, which are never used by the Deuteronomist.

5. Thus it will be found that the quotations from Joshua in the above Table cover (so to speak) the following ground :—

i.5–9,11,15,18, ii.11, iii.3,6,8,13,14,17, iv.9,10,16ᵃ,18, v 1, vi.6,12,19,24, vii.5,12, viii.1,31–34, ix.24,27ᵇ, x.12,14,25,40,42, xi.6,11,14,20,23, xii.6,7, xiii.6,7, xviii.3, xx.6ᵇ, xxii.22, xxiii.2,3,6,8–11,13–16, xxiv.1,8,13,20,26.

It would seem, then, judging only from the above, that *nothing* of Jo.xv,xvi,xvii,xix,xxi, and *very little* of Jo.ii,v,ix,xii,xiii,xiv, xviii,xx,xxii, betrays any strong resemblance to the style of the Deuteronomist. But, since the Table in (3) does not by any means exhaust all the signs of his hand, which may be noted in the Book of Joshua, it is possible, of course, that other passages may belong to him, which are not above indicated. We shall now see, however, that just exactly in the intervals between the above references are found distinct traces of the older narrative, in the use of expressions, which, as shown in (III.548),—

are common throughout the first four Books of the Pentateuch, but are never employed by the Deuteronomist.

6. The reader will find in (III.548) the references which show the use of most of these formulæ in the first four Books of the Pentateuch, *though not one of them is used in Deuteronomy*. In the other cases, the references are given below.

(i) אֲחֻזָּה, *ăkhuzzah*, 'possession,' 39 times in the older matter of the Pentateuch,—also Jo.xxi.12,41(39), xxii.4,9,19,19.

(ii) גָּוַע, *gavah*, 'give up the ghost,' 10 times in G.,N.,—also Jo.xxii.20.

(iii) מַטֶּה, *matteh*, 'tribe,' 96 times in E.,L.,N.,—also Jo.vii.1,18, xiii.15,24,29, xiv.1,2,2,3,3,4, xv.1,20,21, xvi.8,xvii.1, xviii.11,21, xix.1,8,23,24,31,39,40,48,51, xx.8, 8,8, xxi(*passim*), xxii.1,14.

(iv) 'the bone of this day,'=the selfsame day, 12 times in the older matter,—also Jo.v.11. x.27.

(v) 'statute and ordinance,' E.xv.25,—also Jo.xxiv.25.

(vi) 'land of Canaan,' 53 times in the older matter,—also Jo.v.12, xiv.1, xxi.2, xxii.9,10,11,32, xxiv.3.

(vii) 'plains of Moab,' 11 times in the older matter,—also Jo.xiii.32.

(viii) עֵדָה, *hedah*, 'congregation,' 110 times in E.,L.,N.,—also Jo.ix.15,18, 18,19,21,27[a], xviii.1. xx.6[a],9, xxii.12,16,17,18,20,30.

N.B. In the *Deuteronomistic* part of Joshua, viii.35, we find קָהָל, *kahal*, 'assembly,' as always (11 times) in Deuteronomy.

(ix) 'tent of the Congregation,' 135 times in E.,L.,N.,—also Jo.xviii.1, xix.51.

(x) מִשְׁכָּן, *mishkan*, 'Tabernacle,' 97 times in E.,L.,N.,—also Jo.xxii.19,29.

(xi) עֵדוּת, *heduth*, 'Testimony,' 35 times in E.,L.,N.,—also Jo.iv.16[b].

(xii) מִקְלָט, *miklat*, 'refuge,' N.xxxv.6,11,12,13,14,15,25,26,27,28,32,—also Jo.xx.2,3, xxi.13,21,27,32,38(36),—only besides in 1Ch.vi.57(42),67(52).

(xiii) נָשִׂיא, *nasi*, 'prince,' 70 times in G.,E.,L.,N.,—also Jo.ix.15,18,18,19,21,21, xiii,21, xvii.4, xxii.14,14,14,30,32.

(xiv) 'in (בְּ, לְ) your (their, &c.), generations,' 31 times in G.,E.,L.,N.,—also Jo.xxii.27,28.

(xv) בִּשְׁגָגָה, *bishgagah*, 'by inadvertence,' L.iv.2,22,27,v.15,18,xxii.14,N.xv.24, 25,25,26,27,28,29, xxxv.11,15,—also Jo.xx.3,9.

7. If, as before, we sum up in one view the passages in Joshua, which the above Table exhibits, as agreeing in phraseology with the older matter of the Pentateuch, we shall have the following result:—

iv.16[b], v.11,12, vii.1,18, ix.15,18,19,21,27[a], x.27, xiii.15,21,24,29,32, xiv.1–4, xv.1,20,21, xvi.8, xvii.1,4, xviii.1,11,21, xix.1,8,23,24,31,39,40,48,51, xx.2,3,6[a],8,9, xxi.2,12,13,21,27,32,38,41, xxii.1,4,9–12,14,16–20,27–30,32, xxiv.3,25.

It will be seen, as we have said, that the above references fall exactly into the interstices between the verses quoted in the list given in (5) except in three instances, iv.16[b], ix.27[a], xx.6[a], where single verses appear to belong partly to the Deuteronomist, and partly to the older document. It would seem also, judging as before, that *much* of Jo.ix,xiii,xix,xxi,xxii, belongs to the older matter.

8. On the first two of the above three excepted instances we note as follows:—

(i) The expression in Jo.iv.16$^{b}$ is 'ark of the Testimony,' which occurs repeatedly in the older matter, E.xxv.22, xxvi.33,34, xxx.6,26, xxxi.7, xxxix.35, xl.3,5,21, N.iv.5, vii.89, *comp.* 'tent of the Testimony,' E.xxxviii.21, N.i.50,53,53, ix.15, x.11, xvii.7,8, xviii.2, 'vail of the Testimony,' L.xxiv.3,—neither of which expressions is used by the Deuteronomist, who employs always 'ark of the Covenant of Jehovah,' D.x.8, xxxi.9,25,26, Jo.iii.3,17, iv.7,18, vi.8, viii.33, or 'ark of the Covenant,' Jo.iii.6,6,8,11,14, iv.9, vi.6, or 'ark of Jehovah,' iii.13, iv.5,11, vi.11,12, vii.6. From this also it seems probable that N.x.33, xiv.44, where we have also 'ark of the Covenant of Jehovah,' are Deuteronomistic interpolations.

But in Jo.iv.16$^{a}$, we have 'Command the priests, *bearers of the ark* of the Testimony'; and this phrase, 'bearers of the ark,' is never used in the older matter either of priests or Levites; whereas the Deuteronomist speaks repeatedly of 'priests' or 'Levites' (*i.e.* according to his view, 'priests') 'bearing the ark of the *Covenant*,' D.x.8, xxxi.9,25, Jo.iii.8,14,17, iv.9,18, viii.33. May it be that Jo.iv.16$^{b}$ is Deuteronomistic, as well as *v.*16$^{a}$, though העדות has by some means been substituted for הברית? In fact, the expression 'bearers of the ark of *the Testimony*,' occurs nowhere else in the whole Bible.

(ii) ix.27$^{b}$, 'unto the place which He will choose,' is manifestly a Deuteronomistic addition to the verse as it originally stood, ending with 'until this day.' It will be seen that in the former part of the verse,—where it is said 'Joshua made them that day hewers of wood and drawers of water for *the Congregation*, and for the *altar of Jehovah*, unto this day,'—notice is taken of the words of the princes in *v.*21, 'let them be hewers &c. *for* all *the Congregation*,' and of those of Joshua in *v.*23, 'hewers &c. for the *House of my God*.'

9. In like manner a little consideration will show that Jo.xx.6, or, rather, Jo.xx.1–6, is plainly composed out of two different sources. And the close examination of this passage will be instructive, as showing the manner in which the language of Deuteronomy is blended with that of the older document, either by a Compiler who had before him both documents, as some suppose, or, as we rather see reason to believe, by the Deuteronomist himself, while engaged in editing and enlarging the original narrative.

(i) The *groundwork* of Jo.xx.1–6 is in the same style as N.xxxv.9–15, to which passage, evidently, reference is made in the words of *v.*2, 'Give for you the *cities of refuge*, whereof I spake unto you by the hand of Moses,' since the phrase 'cities of refuge' occurs in N.xxxv.6,11,12,14, but *not* in either of the parallel passages of Deuteronomy, D.iv.41–43, xix.1–13.

(ii) *v.*3,9, 'for the fleeing thither of the slayer, smiting a soul *by inadvertence*,' agrees with N.xxxv.11, 'and there shall flee thither the slayer, smiting a soul *by inadvertence*,' where we have בִּשְׁגָגָה, *bishgagah*, 'by inadvertence,' which occurs 15 times in L.,N.,(6.xv), but nowhere in Deuteronomy, or anywhere else in the Bible, except, partially, in Ecc.v.6(5), x.5.

(iii) *v.*3,5, בִּלְתִּי דַעַת, *bilti dahath*, 'without knowing,' occurs in D.iv.42,xix.4, but *not* in the parallel passage, N.xxxv.9–15, nor anywhere in the older document.

(iv) *v.*3, 'and they shall be to you for a refuge from the avenger of blood,' agrees with N.xxxv.12, 'and the cities shall be to you for a refuge from the avenger,' but does not occur in Deuteronomy.

(v) *v.*4, 'and he shall flee unto one out of these cities,' occurs identically in D.iv.42, xix.5,11, as does also 'the elders of that city,' in D.xxi.3,4,6, xxii.18,—(*comp.* also the process described in D.xxii.15,xxv.7,)—but is *not* found in N.xxxv.

(vi) *v.*5, 'and if the avenger of blood pursue after him';

*comp.* 'lest the avenger of blood pursue after the slayer,' D.xix.6.

(vii) *v.*5, 'and they shall not *shut-up* the slayer in his hand';

*comp.* 'thou shalt not *shut-up* a servant unto his master,' D.xxiii.15.

(viii) *v.*5, 'for *without knowing* he smote *his neighbour*, and was *not hating him aforetime*,' (lit. 'from yesterday the third day');

*comp.* 'who slew (smote) *his neighbour without knowing*, and he was *not hating him aforetime*,' D.iv.42, xix.4, 'he was *not hating him aforetime*,' xix.6: but this formula does *not* occur in N.xxxv.9–15.

(ix) *v.*6, 'and he shall dwell in that city until his standing before the Congregation for judgment, until the death of the high priest';

*comp.* 'and he shall dwell in it, until the death of the high priest,' N.xxxv.25;

'until his standing before the congregation for judgment,' N.xxxv.12.

(x) *v.*6ᵇ, 'that shall be in those days,' occurs in D.xvii.9, xix.17, xxvi.3, but *not* in the older matter, the description in the parallel passage, N.xxxv.25, 'the priest that (one) anointed with the holy oil.'

(xi) *v.*6ᵇ, 'then the slayer shall return, and go unto his city, and unto his house whence he fled,' does not agree with the language of N.xxxv.28, 'the slayer shall return unto the land of his possession,' and shows also the use of אָז, *az*, 'then,' with the *future*, as in D.iv.41, Jo.viii.30, x.12, xxii.1, which occurs nowhere in the first four Books of the Pentateuch.

10. The whole passage, Jo.xx.1–6, may now be exhibited as follows, the Deuteronomistic portions being here italicised.

(1) 'And Jehovah spake unto Joshua, saying, (2) Speak unto the sons of Israel, saying, Give for you the cities of refuge, whereof I spake unto you by the hand of Moses, (3) for the fleeing thither of the slayer, smiting a soul by inadvertence, *without knowing*, and they shall be to you for a refuge from the avenger of blood. (4) *And he shall flee unto one out of these cities, and stand at the opening of the gate of the city, and speak in the ears of the elders of that city his words, and they shall gather him into the city unto them, and shall give him a place, and he shall dwell*

*with them.* (5) *And, if the avenger of blood pursue after him, then they shall not shut up the slayer in his hand; for without knowing he smote his neighbour, and was not hating him aforetime.* (6) And he shall dwell in that city until his standing before the Congregation for judgment, until the death of the high priest, *who shall be in those days; then shall the slayer return and go unto his city and unto his house, unto the city whence he fled.*'

11. It may be that something of the old document, corresponding to *v.*4,5, has been omitted between the end of *v.*3 and the beginning of *v.*6, to which the latter refers in the words, 'and *he* shall dwell *in that city*,' or else the beginning of *v.*6 has been modified, in consequence of the introduction of *v.*4,5. Perhaps it may have stood originally in *v.*6,—

'And *the slayer* shall dwell in *the city of his refuge whither he was fled*, &c.'—

in accordance with the language of N.xxxv.25,26,27,28,32; or some similar words, about the 'slayer' and 'the city of his refuge,' may have preceded *v.*6. As it now stands, though the sense is continuous between *v.*5 and *v.*6, yet the insertion of *v.*4,5, leaves a break in the connection after *v.*3, since the context runs at present—

'and they shall be to you for a refuge from the avenger of blood. (4) And *he* shall flee, &c.'—

where there is no subject to which 'he shall flee' can be immediately referred.

12. It seems, then, to be certain that in Jo.xx.1–6 the language of the older document has been retouched, and blended with that of the Deuteronomist; and we shall find, hereafter, when we come to consider more closely the contents of the whole Book of Joshua, that the same thing has occurred in other passages. But if this is the case in Joshua, the question arises whether the same phenomenon may not also be found to exist, upon closer inspection, in the first four Books of the Pentateuch. We shall see, as we proceed, that this is really the fact; in short, we shall find plain evidences that the Deuteronomist has revised and retouched the manuscript of the existing Tetrateuch, which had come into his hands, before he added to it the sum and substance of the Law, in the Book of Deuteronomy.

13. But the general result of the investigation in this Chapter is this—that, while the groundwork of the Book of Joshua belongs, as we have said, to the older document, including especially those parts which describe the *partition* of the land among the different tribes, a very considerable portion —in fact, more than half—of the Book, especially of the *historical and hortatory* matter, consists of Deuteronomistic interpolations. From this it follows that the writer of Deuteronomy cannot have been Moses, at all events; since he here, in Joshua, relates events which took place long after the death of Moses, —after the conquest of the land had been completed, Jo.xxiv.13, —after Joshua was 'waxen old' and about to die, Jo.xxiii.2,14. In short, the conclusion, which we have thus arrived at, accords completely, so far as it goes, with that which we have obtained already in Part III, from a careful examination of the contents of Deuteronomy itself, *viz.* that the writer of this Book lived certainly in the age of one of the later kings of Judah, and most probably, as it appears to us, in the time of Josiah, ± 630 B.C.

# CHAPTER II.

## THE ELOHISTIC PORTIONS OF GENESIS.

14. HAVING thus determined, with some approach to certainty, the age of the Deuteronomist, it now becomes a matter of great interest to determine, if possible, with a like degree of probability, the approximate age of the Elohistic writer of Genesis, whom critics generally allow to have been the earliest of the writers concerned in the composition of the Pentateuch, and to have laid the foundation for the whole work. We shall then have shut up, as it were, the composition of the Pentateuch between two limits; and the investigation as to the age of the other writers, whose hands are plainly to be traced in it, will be a matter—of deep interest still, but yet—of comparatively secondary importance.

15. It is my desire in this Part of my work to endeavour to contribute something towards the solution of this problem. And I am not without hope that the results which I have arrived at will be deemed upon the whole satisfactory—so far, at all events, as to supply some aid to others, who may desire to engage themselves in this enquiry. For this purpose, it is necessary in the first place to extract from the present Book of Genesis the portions of the Elohistic document which it contains, in as a complete a form as possible. And no expenditure of time and labour, which may be required for this purpose, will be deemed superfluous or ill-bestowed by any, who are practically acquainted with the difficulties of the case, and

who appreciate at the same time the very great importance of these researches, in their relation to some of the momentous controversies of the present day.

16. After much consideration and many experiments, I have found no method of proceeding so satisfactory as that which I have already pursued in Part IV, with reference to the First Eleven Chapters of Genesis—*viz.* that of carefully and minutely analysing each particular section—rather each single verse, line, and word—of the whole Book of Genesis, with the view of marking the peculiarities which distinguish the different authors, and tracking closely their steps. I have completed this Analysis, and the reader will find it given at full length at the end of this volume. I shall now, therefore, be at liberty to assume as sufficiently proved the results which I have thus obtained. And I have bestowed on this Analysis the more minute care and labour, because it will serve as a ground-work for further enquiries, and lend us help hereafter when we come to separate the portions due to the different authors in other parts of the Pentateuch.

17. The great—and, indeed, till very lately, almost the sole—authority in this department of Biblical Criticism, as far as regards the Book of Genesis, has been the classical work of Prof. HUPFELD of Halle, *die Quellen der Genesis* (1853)—in which treatise, however, very honourable mention is made of the labours of ILGEN, in his *Urkunden des Jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs*, published so long ago as 1798. In ILGEN'S work, Prof. HUPFELD tells us, he found repeatedly the results of his own researches most happily anticipated—as, of course, was to be expected, if they were *real* results, founded upon actual facts, and deduced by sound reasoning from the same phenomena. And most other modern critics,—except, perhaps, KNOBEL,—who have entered upon this particular field of enquiry, seem to have contented themselves with refering to HUPFELD'S masterly treatise, and to have adopted generally his conclusions, without

going through again for themselves the labour required for forming an independent judgment upon the subject.

18. Very recently, however, a valuable addition has been made to this kind of literature by HUPFELD'S pupil, BOEHMER, in his work just published, *das erste Buch der Thora*, in which he has carefully traversed all the ground already trodden by his predecessor, and given fully the reasons for his own conclusions, when they differ in any respect from HUPFELD'S. I had already completed my Analysis of Genesis, when BOEHMER'S work appeared; so that my own results have been attained quite independently of his. But I have now very carefully compared my conclusions with those of both these writers; and the following Tables will enable the reader to see to what extent complete unanimity of opinion exists between these eminent critics, as regards the Elohistic portion of Genesis, and in what point their judgment differs from mine.

19. HUPFELD has summed up the passages of Genesis, which he assigns to the Elohist, on *p.*80–85 of his work. But he makes one or two corrections of this list in later portions of his book, or in other ways, (as indicated in the notes below,) which are taken into account in the following Table.

N.B. *v.*2ª, *v.*2ᵇ, &c. are used to denote the *first, second,* &c. clause of *v.*2; *v.*2ᵖ denotes a *part* of *v.*2.

THE ELOHISTIC PASSAGES OF GENESIS ACCORDING TO HUPFELD.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| G.i.1–31 | G.xix.29 | G.xlviii.3–6 |
| ii.1–3 | xxi.2–5 | xlix.29,33 |
| v.1–28,30–32 | xxiii.1–20 | l.12,13,22 |
| vi.9–22 | xxv.7–11ª (4),12,16ᵇ, | E.i.1–7 |
| vii.6,7,8ᵇ,9 (1),11,13–16ª, | 17,19,20,21ᵇ,26ᵇ | ii.23–25. |
| 18ª,19ᵇ,20ª (2),21,22,24 | xxvi.34,35 | vi.2–9 |
| viii.1,2ª,3ᵇ,4ᵇ (3),5,13–19 | xxviii.1–9 | xii.37,40,41,51 |
| ix.1–17,28,29 | xxxi.17ª(5)',18 | xiii.20 |
| xi.10–26,27,31,32 | xxxv.6,9–15,27–29 | xv.22,23ª,27 |
| xii.4ᵇ,5 | xxxvi.1–8 | xvi.1 |
| xiii.6,11ᵇ,12ª | xxxvii.1 | xvii.1 |
| xvi.3,15,16 | xlvi.6,7 | xix.1,2 |
| xvii.1–27 | xlvii.28 | &c. |

20. BOEHMER assigns to his writer (A), corresponding to our Elohist, the following passages, *p.*3–15.

THE ELOHISTIC PASSAGES OF GENESIS ACCORDING TO BOEHMER.

G.i.1–31
ii.1–3
v.1–28,30–32
vi.9–22
vii.6–9,11,13–16[a], 18,19,20,21,24
viii.1,2[a],3[b],4[ab],5,13–19
ix.1–17,28,29
xi.10–26,27,31,32
G.xii.4[b],5
xiii.6,11[b],12[a]
xvi.3,15[b],16
xvii.1–27
xix.29
xxi.2[(6)],4,5
xxiii.1–20
xxv.7–11[a],17,20,26[b]
xxvi.34,35
G.xxviii.1–9
xxxi.18
xxxv.9–15,27–29
xxxvi.6–8
xxxvii.1
xlvi.6,7
xlvii.11[P(7)],27[b],28
xlix.29–33
l.12,13

21. My own enquiries have led me to the following results.

G.i.1–31
ii.1–3,4[a]
v.1–28,30–32
vi.9–14,17–22
vii.6–9.11,13–16[a], 18[a],19[b],21,22,23[b],24
viii.1,2[a],3[b],4[b],5,13[a],14–19
ix.1–17,28,29
xi.10–26,27,31,32
xii.4[b],5
xiii.6,12[a]
xvi.1,3,15,16
xvii.1–27
xix.29
G.xxi.2–5
xxiii.1–20
xxv.7–11[a],12–16, 17,19,20,21[b],24–26
xxvi.34,35
xxviii.1–9
xxix.24,29,32[P],33[P], 34[a],35[P]
xxx.1[a],4[a],5,6[a],7,8[P],9–13, 17,18[P],19,20[P],21–24[a]
xxxi.18
xxxv.9–15,16[a],19,20[a], 22[b]–26,27–29
G.xxxvi.1–8,9–19,31–35[P], 36–43
xxxvii.1,2[a],28[a],36
xlvi.6,7,8–12[a],13–20[a], 21–26[P],27
xlvii.7–11[P],27[b],28
xlviii.3–7
xlix.1[a],28[b]–33
l.13
E.i.1–7
ii.23[b]–25
vi.2–7
&c.

N.B. I do not include in the above the explanatory notes xxiii.2,19, 'that is Hebron in the land of Canaan,' xxxv.6, 'that is Bethel,' xxxv.27, 'that is Hebron,' xxxvi.43, 'that is Esau, the father of Edom,' which appear to be later interpolations. The Elohist says 'who is Edom,' xxxvi.1, 'Esau is Edom,' xxxvi.8.

---

(1) Q.G.,*p.*207: *not v.*17, Q.G.,*p.*136.

(2) See *Analysis* (32).

(3) Only the words 'in the 7th month, on the 17th day of the month.'

(4) Q.G.,*p.*208.

(5) Q.G.,*p.*32,83: *not v.*17[b],Q.G.,*p.*208.

(6) 'And Sarah conceived and bare . . . at the season which Elohim said to him.'

(7) 'And one gave them possession in the land of Rameses,' E.B.iii.*p.*23.

22. The above Tables will show that considerable unanimity has been attained, as the result of three independent researches, in respect of those portions of Genesis which belong to the Elohist (E). It will be found that my own list assigns to E 336 verses of the whole Book of Genesis, which contains 1,533 verses, leaving 1,197 verses for the non-Elohistic portions; so that, according to this, the Elohistic matter forms just *two-ninths* of the Book of Genesis.

The chief difference between my list and those of HUPFELD and BOEHMER consists in this, that I include as Elohistic passages four *genealogical* sections, xxv.12–17, xxxv.22ᵇ–26, xxxvi.9–43, xlvi.8–27, which they exclude, though HUPFELD writes with some doubt and hesitation about them, and indeed with respect to the last of them he says, *p.*341—

*Perhaps* to the Elohist belongs the precise account of the names of the sons of Jacob, &c., in xlvi.8–27.

He produces, however, some reasons *against* this supposition, to which he seems to have yielded, though to us they do not appear convincing, and the arguments in favour of the Elohistic origin of the section are in our judgment far more conclusive.

23. The above four sections are, indeed, so intimately connected that they must go together; and the opinion formed with regard to any one of them will involve the same decision as to the rest. So KUENEN has noted (note [95], Eng. Trans.)—

Tuch, Stahelin, Delitzsch, and Knobel, ascribe these genealogies to the Elohistic document . . . And, in fact, it is very natural that they should be ascribed either *wholly* to the Elohist or *not at all.*

Hence a difference of opinion on all these four sections amounts only to the same amount of divergence as would be implied by a difference as to any *one* of them.

I conceive also that in xxix, xxx, I have detected some fragments of the Elohistic narrative, which have not been treated as such by HUPFELD and BOEHMER. My other variations from the conclusions of these authors, in respect of the Elohistic

passages, will be found to be very trifling. I must refer the reader to the Analysis for the reasons on which I ground my own judgment where it differs from theirs.

24. It should be observed, however, that the difference of opinion which still remains between myself and these two German critics is not as to whether *more* shall be ascribed to the Elohist than I myself assign to him, but whether *less* shall be ascribed to him. It is *certain* that the list of passages given in (21) contains almost every fragment of Genesis, that can by any possibility be ascribed to this writer. And thus the translation, which is given further on in this volume, contains, I believe, a very complete representation of those fragments of this most ancient document of the Pentateuch, which have been left in the present Book of Genesis. It was worth while to have taken great pains to arrive, if possible, at a clear conception on this point; because now, with the Elohistic document almost in its entirety before us, we shall be able to mark more distinctly its peculiar characteristics, and its points of difference from the later portions of Genesis, and to detect, perhaps, some signs of time, which may help to determine the age in which it was written.

# CHAPTER III.

## CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ELOHISTIC PORTIONS OF GENESIS.

25. THE *Analysis* contains a full examination of every chapter and verse in the Book of Genesis; and to this the student must be referred, who wishes thoroughly to master the subject, or to learn on what grounds any particular passage is assigned to its proper author. But for the sake of the general reader we shall here sum up in one view the principal features, which are found to characterise the Elohistic document. We omit here, of course, the innumerable connecting links, and references to previous notices of the same writer, which are marked, as they occur, in the course of the Analysis; and we mention only for our present purpose the more salient points of his style, as they are found to distinguish the products of his pen throughout the whole of Genesis.

26. *Characteristics of the Elohistic Portions of Genesis.*

N.B. Those formulæ, to which an asterisk is prefixed, *do not occur at all in the non-Elohistic parts of Genesis*, which we may denote collectively for the present by X, while we denote the Elohistic matter by E.

*(i) 'after his (their) kind,' i.11,12,12,21,21,24,24,25,25,25, vi.20,20,20, vii.14, 14,14,14.

*(ii) שֶׁרֶץ, *sharats*, 'swarm,' שֶׁרֶץ, *sherets*, 'swarming-things,' i.20,20,21, vii.21, 21, viii.17, ix.7, E.i.7.

*(iii) פְּרָה וְרָבָה, *parah věravah*, 'fructify and multiply,' i.22,28, viii.17, ix.1,7, xvii.(2 + 6),20, xxviii.3, xxxv.11, xlvii.27, xlviii.4;

*comp.* גָּבַר וְרָבָה, *gavar věravah*, 'be mighty and multiply,' vii.18.

(iv) 'these are the generations of the heaven and of the earth,' ii.4*a*;

*comp.* 'this is the book of the generations of Adam,' v.1;

'these are the generations of' Noah, vi.9, of Shem, xi.10, of Jacob, xxxvii.2[a];

'and these are the generations of' Terah, xi.27, of Ishmael, xxv.12, of Isaac, xxv.19, of Esau, xxxvi.1,9:

X has 'and these are the generations of the sons of Noah,' x.1.

*(v) הוֹלִיד, *hoḳlid*, 'beget,' v.3,4, &c. *twenty-eight times*, vi.10, xi.10,11, &c. *twenty-nine times*, xvii.20, xxv.19, xlviii.6:

X has the *Hophal* form of this verb once, xl.20; but in the formula where E has הוֹלִיד, X employs *always* יָלַד, *yalad*, iv.18,18,18, vi.4, x.8,13,15,24,24,26, xxii.23, xxv.3, which E *never* uses in the sense 'beget.'

*(vi) מֵאַת, *mĕath*, 'hundred,' v.3,6,18,25,28, vii.24, viii.3[b], xi.10,25, xxi.5, xxv.7, 17, xxxv.28, xlvii.9,28:

X uses מֵאָה, *meah*, *always*, vi.3, xxvi.12, xxxiii.19, l.22,26, which E has also in xvii.17, xxiii.1.

*(vii) 'in (after) his (their) generations (דֹּרֹת, *dorŏth*),' vi.9, xvii.7,9,12.

*(viii) 'all flesh,' vi.12,13,17,19, vii.15,16,21, viii.17, ix.11,15,15,16,17.

(ix) אָנִי, *ăni*, 'I,' vi.17, ix.9,12, xvii.1, xxxv.11, xlviii.7, xlix.29, E.vi.2,5,7, in preference to אָנֹכִי, *ănochi*, 'I,' which E uses only once, xxiii.4:

X uses the latter *fifty-four*, and the former *thirty*, times, (30.x).

*(x) גָּוַע, *gavah*, 'expire,' vi.17, vii.21, xxv.8,17, xxxv.29, xlix.33.

*(xi) 'with (אֶת) thee,' 'with them,' &c. used as a kind of expletive, vi.18,19, vii.7,13,23[b], viii.1,16,17,17,18, ix.8,10,10, xi.31, xvii.27, xxi.2, xxviii.4, xlvi.6,7,7.

*(xii) 'thou and thy sons and thy wife and thy sons' wives with thee,' vi.18;

'Noah and his sons and his wife and his sons' wives with him,' vii.7, viii.18;

'Noah, and Shem, Ham, and Japheth, Noah's sons, and Noah's wife, and his sons' three wives with them,' vii.13;

'thou and thy wife and thy sons and thy sons' wives with thee,' viii.16;

'Jacob, and all his seed with him, his sons and his sons' sons with him, his daughters and his sons' daughters,' xlvi.6,7.

*(xiii) '*give* a covenant,' ix.12, xvii.2,7,19, '*establish* a covenant,' vi.18, ix.9,11,17, xvii.21, E.vi.4:

X has *always* 'cut a covenant,' xv.18, xxi.27,32, xxvi.28, xxxi.44, which E *never* uses.

*(xiv) 'my (his) covenant,' vi.18, ix.9,11,12,13,15,16,17, xvii.2,4,7,9,10,13,14,19, 21, E.ii.24, vi.4,5.

*(xv) 'in the bone of this day' = on the selfsame day, vii.13, xvii.23,26.

*(xvi) 'and Elohim remembered' Noah, viii.1, Abraham, xix.29, Rachel, xxx.22, His covenant, E.ii.24;

*comp.* 'I will remember My covenant,' ix.15, 'to remember the covenant,' ix.16, 'I have remembered My covenant,' E.vi.5.

*(xvii) 'with you and your seed after you,' ix.9;

'between thee and thy seed after thee,' xvii.7;

'to thee and thy seed after thee,' xvii.7,8, xxxv.12;

'thou and thy seed after thee,' xvii.9;

'between you and thy seed after thee,' xvii.10;
'with him to his seed after him,' xvii.19;
'to thee and to thy seed with thee,' xxviii.4;
'Jacob and all his seed with him,' xlvi.6:

X has 'to thy seed,' xii.7, xv.18, xxiv.7, xxvi.4, 'to thee and to thy seed for ever,' xiii.15, 'to thee and to thy seed,' xxvi.3, xxviii.13—*never* 'thy seed after thee' or 'thy seed with thee.'

(xviii) 'everlasting generations,' ix.12, 'everlasting covenant,' ix.16,xvii.7,13,19, 'everlasting possession,' xvii.8, xlviii.4;

X has 'everlasting Elohim,' xxi.33, 'everlasting mountains,' xlix.26.

(xix) נֶפֶשׁ, *nephesh*, 'soul,' used for 'person,' xii.5, xvii.14, xxxvi.6, xlvi.15,18, 22,25,26,26,27:

X has this once, xiv.21.

*(xx) 'and Abram took Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother's son, and all their gain (רְכוּשׁ, *rĕchush*) which they had gotten (רָכַשׁ, *rachash*), and the souls which they had made in Charran,' xii.5;

'and he led-off all his cattle and all his gain which he had gotten, the cattle of his wealth (קִנְיָן, *kinyan*), which he had gotten in Padan-Aram,' xxxi.18;

'and Esau took his wives and his sons and his daughters, and all the souls of his house and his cattle and all his beasts and all his wealth which he had gotten in the land of Canaan,' xxxvi.6;

'and they took their cattle and their gain which they had gotten in the land of Canaan,' xlvi.6.

*(xxi) 'and the land did not bear them to dwell together; for their gain was much, and they were not able to dwell together,' xiii.6;

'for their gain was much above dwelling together; and the land of their sojournings was not able to bear them because of their cattle,' xxxvi.7.

*(xxii) appearance of God as 'El Shaddai' to the patriarchs, xvii.1, xxxv.11, xlviii.3, E.vi.3.

*(xxiii) בִּמְאֹד מְאֹד, *bimod mĕod*, 'exceedingly,' xvii.2,6,20, E.i.7:

X has מְאֹד מְאֹד, *mĕod mĕod*, vii.19[a], xxx.43.

*(xxiv) 'thou shalt be a father of a *multitude of nations*,' xvii.4;

'a father of a *multitude of nations* will I *give* thee,' xvii.5;

'I will *give* thee for *nations*,' xvii.6;

'I will *give* him (Ishmael) for a great nation,' xvii.20;

'that thou mayest be for a *company of peoples*,' xxviii.3;

'a nation and a *company of nations* shall be out of thee,' xxxv.11;

'I will *give* thee for a *company of peoples*,' xlviii.4.

N.B. E speaks of many 'nations' being formed by the descendants of Abraham, and uses the formula 'give thee (him)' for a nation or nations: whereas X has the following formulæ, but never uses the expression 'give' in this connection, nor the phrase 'company (multitude) of nations (peoples)':—

'I will make thee for a great nation,' xii.2;

'he shall surely be for a great and mighty nation,' xviii.18;
'I will *place* him (Ishmael) for a nation,' xxi.13;
'for a great nation will I *place* him,' xxi.18;
'two nations are in thy womb,
and two folks shall be separated from thee,' xxv.23;
'for a great nation will I *place* thee,' xlvi.3;
'his (Ephraim's) seed shall be the fulness of nations,' xlviii.19.

*(xxv) 'kings shall go-forth out of thee,' xvii.6;
'kings of peoples shall be out of her,' xvii.16;
'kings shall go-forth out of thy loins,' xxxv.11;
'the souls that went-forth out of his (Jacob's) thigh,' xlvi.26, E.i.5.

*(xxvi) 'I will give to thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land of thy sojournings, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession,' xvii.8;
'that He may give to thee the blessing of Abraham, to thee and to thy seed with thee, that thou mayest inherit the land of thy sojournings, which Elohim gave to Abraham,' xxviii.4;
'and the land which I gave to Abraham and to Isaac, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed after thee will I give the land,' xxxv.12;
'to give to them the land of Canaan, the land of their sojournings in which they sojourned,' E.vi.4.

*(xxvii) 'land of thy (their, his father's) sojournings,' xvii.8, xxviii.4, xxxvi.7, xxxvii.1, E.vi.4;
*comp.* 'days of the years of my sojournings,' xlvii.9, 'days of their sojournings,' xlvii.9.

*(xxviii) אֲחֻזָּה, *ăkhuzzah*, 'possession,' xvii.8, xxiii.4,9,20, xxxvi.43, xlvii.11, xlviii.4, xlix.30, l.13.

*(xxix) 'the years of the life of' Sarah, xxiii.1, Ishmael, xxv. 17;
*comp.* 'the days of the years of the life of Abraham,' xxv.7;
'the days of Isaac,' xxxv.28;
'the days of the years of thy (my) life,' xlvii.8,9;
'the days of the years of my sojournings,' xlvii.9;
'the days of the years of my father's life,' xlvii.9;
'the days of Jacob, of the years of his life,' xlvii.28:
X has 'all the days of thy life,' iii.14,17.

*(xxx) E describes frequently with almost legal precision the cave of Machpelah, which is mentioned nowhere else in the Bible, xxiii.17,18,19,20, xxv.9,10, xlix.29, 30,32, l.13.

*(xxxi) E mentions expressly the burial and burial-place of Sarah, xxiii.9, of Abraham, xxv.9, of Isaac, xxxv.29, of Rachel, xxxv.19, xlviii.7, of Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebekah, and Leah, xlix.31, of Jacob, xlix.29, l.13.

*(xxxii) 'and Abraham (Ishmael, Isaac) expired and died, and was gathered unto his people,' xxv.8,17, xxxv.29;
*comp.* 'I shall be gathered unto my people,' xlix.29;
'and he expired and was gathered unto his people,' xlix.33;
*also* 'he shall be cut off from his people,' xvii.14.

*(xxxiii) 'and his sons, Isaac and Ishmael, buried him,' xxv.9;
'and his sons, Esau and Jacob, buried him,' xxxv.29;
'and his sons . . . buried him,' l.13.

(xxxiv) E uses אֵת, *eth*, 'with,' *fifty-one* times, *viz.* v.22,24, vi.9,13,18,18,19, vii.7,13,23[b], viii.1,16,17,17,18, ix.8,9,9,10,10,10,11,12, xi.31, xvii.3,4,19,21,22,23, 27,27, xxi.2, xxiii.8,8,20, xxv.10, xxviii.4, xxxv.13,14,15, xxxvii.2[a],2[a],2[a], xlvi.6,7,7, xlix.30,32, l.13,13,—and עִם, *him*, 'with,' only *twice*, xxiii.4,4:

X uses אֵת *seventy-nine* times, and עִם *ninety-three* times.

27. The reader will thus perceive how numerous and distinct are the characteristic signs of this writer, who uses 'Elohim' or 'El' throughout his narrative 87 times, or rather 88 times, if we reckon the 'Elohim' which appears to have stood originally in xvii.1 (*Anal.* 92,93). It is not, of course, intended to say that *any one* of the above phenomena, *occurring alone*, would be enough to show that the passage in which it occurs belongs certainly to E, or that none of them may be found to be used by other writers of the Pentateuch. Thus the common words אֵת and עִם, for 'with,' are used in X as well as in E. But, when we consider that the matter in X constitutes *seven-ninths* of the whole of Genesis (22), *i.e.* 3½ times as much as the matter in E, and that, consequently, if E uses אֵת 51 times and עִם *twice*, X should contain, in the same proportion, אֵת, 178 times, and עִם, 7 times, whereas it actually has the former 79 times and the latter 93 times, it seems plain that E had a special partiality for the use of אֵת rather than עִם.

28. Still, many of the above formulæ are so peculiar that, even if occurring by themselves in any other part of the Pentateuch, they would be enough to suggest that we have before us *very probably* a passage of the Elohistic document, and to turn the scale in favour of this view, if there were no decisive indications to the contrary. But, when *several* of them are found together in the same context, with no opposing phenomena, it is scarcely possible to doubt the Elohistic origin of the passage so marked.

# CHAPTER IV.

## CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NON-ELOHISTIC PORTIONS OF GENESIS.

29. We shall now reverse the picture, and set before the reader the following Table, which contains a list of some of the more prominent peculiarities which characterise the *non*-Elohistic parts of Genesis, denoted above by X. We shall first give only those formulæ which occur at least *twenty* times in X, equivalent to about *six* times in E, since the matter in X (27) is 3½ times larger in quantity than that in E.

30. *Characteristics of the non-Elohistic portions of Genesis.*

N.B. As before, those formulæ, which are marked by an asterisk, *do not occur at all in the Elohistic parts of Genesis.*

*(i) עָבַד *havad*, 'serve,' ii.5,15, iii.23, iv.2,12, xv.13,14, xxv.23, xxvii.29,40, xxix.15,18,20,25,27,30, xxx.26,26,29, xxxi.6,41, xlix.15,—*twenty-two* times;

עֶבֶד *heved*, 'servant' or 'slave,' ix.25,26,27, xii.16, xiv.15, xviii.3,5, xix.2,19, xx.8,14, xxi.25, xxiv.2,5,9,10,14,17,34,35,52,53,59,61,65,65,66, xxvi.15,19,24,25,32, xxvii.37, xxx.43, xxxii.4(5),5(6),10(11),16(17),16(17),18(19),20(21), xxxiii.5,14, xxxix.17,19, xl.20,20, xli.10,12,37,38, xlii.10,11,13, xliii.18,28, xliv.7,9,9,10,16,16, 17,18,18,19,21,23,24,27,30,31,31,32,33, xlv.16, xlvi.34, xlvii.3,4,4,19,25, l.2,7,17,18, —*eighty-six* times:

E uses עֲבֹדָה, 'service,' in speaking of the Egyptian *slavery*, E.i.14,14,14,ii.23,23, which X has in G.xxix.27, xxx.26.

*(ii) שִׂים *sim*, 'place,' ii.8, iv.15, vi.16, ix.23, xiii.16, xxi.13,14,18, xxii.6,9, xxiv.2,9,33,47, xxvii.37, xxviii.11,18,18,22, xxx.36,41,42, xxxi.21,34,37, xxxii.12 (13), 16(17), xxxiii.2, xxxvii.34, xl.15, xli.42, xliii.22,31,32, xliv.1,2,21, xlv.7,8,9, xlvi 3, xlvii.6,26,29, xlviii.18,20,20,—*forty-seven* times.

(iii) הוּא, *hu*, 'he, she, it,' ii.11,13,14,14,19, iii.6,12,15,16,20, iv.4,20,21,22,26, vi.3, vii.2, ix.18, x.8,9,12,21, xii.14,18,19, xiii.1, xiv.12,13,15,18, xv.2,4, xvi.12, xviii.1,8,10, xix.20,20,30, xx.2,3,5,5,5,5,7,12,13,16, xxi.13,17, xxii.20,24, xxiv.7, 15,44,54,62,65, xxv.21*,29, xxvi.7,7,9,9, xxvii.31,33,38, xxix.9,12,12,25, xxx.33,

xxxi.16,20,21,43, xxxii.18(19),21(22),31(32), xxxiii.3, xxxiv.14,19, xxxv.6, xxxvi. 24, xxxvii.2$^{b}$,3,27,32, xxxviii.12,14,16,21,25,25, xxxix.3,6,22,23, xl.10, xli.11,25,26, 28, xlii.6,14,27,38, xliii.12,32, xliv.5,10,14,17,20, xlv.20,26, xlvii.6,18, xlviii.14,19, 19, xlix.13,19,20, l.14,22,—a *hundred and twenty-eight* times:

E has it *thrice*, ix.3, xvii.12, xxiii.15.

N.B. I have not reckoned the passages in E or X, where this pronoun is used in a mere note of explanation, *viz.* xiv.2,3,7,8,17, xix.37,38, xxiii.2,19, xxxv.6,15, 20,27, xxxvi.1,8,19,43, xlviii.7.

(iv) use of *indicative* with *infinitive, e.g.* 'eating eat,' 'dying die,' &c. ii.16,17, iii.4,16, xv.13, xvi.10, xviii.10,18, xix.9, xx.7,18, xxii.17,17, xxiv.5, xxvi.28, xxvii. 30, xxviii.22, xxx.16, xxxi.15,30,30, xxxii.12(13), xxxvii.8,8,10,33, xl.15, xliii.3,7, 7,20, xliv.5,15,28, xlvi.4, l.15,24,25,—*thirty-eight* times:

E has it *once*, xvii.13.

*(v) מָצָא, *matsa*, 'find,' ii.20, iv.14,15, vi.8, viii.9, xi.2, xvi.7, xviii.3,26,28,29, 30,30,31,32, xix.11,15,19, xxvi.12,19,32, xxvii.20, xxx.14,27, xxxi.32,33,34,35,37, xxxii.5(6),19(20), xxxiii.8,10,15, xxxiv.11, xxxvi.24, xxxvii.15,17,32, xxxviii.20,22, 23, xxxix.4, xli.38, xliv.8,9,10,12,16,16,17,34, xlvii.14,25,29, l.4,—*fifty-six* times.

*(vi) 'and he (she, one, &c.) called his name . . . *for*, &c.,'—'*therefore* he (she, one, &c.) called his name, &c.,' ii.23, iii.20, iv.25, xvi.11, xxvi.20,22, xxvii.36, xxix.32,xxxii.30(31),xxxv.7, xli.51,52 ; *comp.* xxix.33$^{d}$—xi.9, xvi.14, xix.22, xxi.31, xxv.30, xxvi.33, xxix.34$^{d}$,35$^{e}$, xxx.6$^{b}$, xxxi.48, xxxiii.17, l.11,—*twenty-five* times.

*(vii) יָדַע, *yadah*, 'know,' iii.5,5,7,22, iv.1,9,17,25, viii.11, ix.24, xii.11, xv.8, 13,13, xviii.19,21, xix.5,8,33,35, xx.6,7, xxi.26, xxii.12, xxiv.14,16,21, xxv.27, xxvii.2, xxviii.16, xxix.5,5, xxx.26,29, xxxi.6,32, xxxiii.13, xxxviii.9,16,26, xxxix. 6,8, xli.21,31,39, xlii.23,33,34, xliii.7,7,22, xliv.15,27, xlv.1, xlvii.6, xlviii.19,—*fifty-six* times.

(viii) גַּם, *gam*, 'also,' iii.6,22, iv.4,22,26, vi.3,4, vii.3, x.21, xiii.5,16, xiv.7,16, 16, xv.14, xvi.13, xix.21,34,35, xx.4,5,6,6,12, xxi.13,26,26, xxii.20,24, xxiv.14,19, 25,25,25,44,44,46,46, xxvi.21, xxvii.31,33,34,38,45, xxix.27,30,30,33, xxx.3,6$^{b}$,8$^{b}$, 15,30, xxxi.15, xxxii.6(7),18(19),19(20),19(20),19(20),20(21), xxxiii.7, xxxv.17, xxxvii.7, xxxviii.10,11,22,24, xl.15, xlii.22,28, xliii.8,8,8, xliv.9,10,16,16,29, xlvi.4, 34,34, xlvii.3,3,19,19, xlviii.11,19,19,l.9,9,18,23,—*ninety-two* times:

E has וְגַם, 'and also,' *once*, xvii.16, and again in E.vi.4,5.

*(ix) יָרֵא, *yare*, 'fear,' iii.10, xv.1, xviii.15, xix.30, xxi.17, xxii.12, xxvi.7,24, xxviii.17,17, xxxi.31, xxxii.7(8),11(12), xxxv.17, xlii.18,35, xliii.18,23, xlvi.3, l. 19,21,—*twenty-one* times.

(x) אָנֹכִי, *ănochi*, 'I,' iii.10, iv.9, vii.4, xv.1,2,14, xvi.5,8, xviii.27, xix.19, xx.6,6, xxi.24,26, xxiv.3,13,24,27,31,34,37,42,43, xxv.22,30,32, xxvi.24,24, xxvii.11, 19, xxviii.15,16,20, xxix.33$^{b}$, xxx.1$^{b}$,2,3, xxxi.5,13,38,39, xxxii.11(12), xxxvii.16, xxxviii.17,25, xliii.9, xlvi.3,4,4, xlvii.30, xlviii.21, l.5,21,24,—*fifty-four* times;

אֲנִי, *ăni*, 'I,' xviii.13, xxii.5, xxiv.45, xxvii.8,24,32,34,38, xxviii.13, xxxi.44,52, xxxiii.14, xxxiv.30,30, xxxvii.10,30,30, xl.16, xli.9,11,15,44, xlii.18,37, xliii.14, xlv.3,4, xlviii.7,22, l.19,—*thirty* times:

E has אָנֹכִי *once*, xxiii.4, but otherwise always, *seven* times, אֲנִי (26.ix).

*(xi) הִגִּיד, *higgid*, 'tell,' iii.11, ix.22, xii.18, xiv.13, xxii.20, xxiv.23,28,49, xxvi.32, xxvii.42, xxix.12,12,15, xxxi.20,22,27, xxxii.5(6),29(30), xxxvii.5,16, xxxviii.13,24, xli.24,25, xlii.29, xliii.6,7, xliv.24, xlv.13,26, xlvi.31, xlvii.1, xlviii.2, xlix.1ᵇ,—*thirty-four* times.

(xii) שָׁלַח, *shalakh*, שִׁלַּח, *shillakh*, 'put-forth, send,' iii.22,23, viii.7,8,9,10,12, xii.20, xviii.16, xix.10,13,29, xx.2, xxi.14, xxii.10,12, xxiv.7,40,54,56,59, xxv.6, xxvi.27,29,31, xxvii.42,45, xxx.25, xxxi.4,27,42, xxxii.3(4),5(6),18(19),26(27), xxxvii.13,14,22,32, xxxviii.17,17,20,23,25, xli.8,14, xlii.4,16, xliii.4,5,8,14, xliv.3, xlv.5,7,8,23,24,27, xlvi.5,28, xlviii.14, xlix.21,—*sixty-four* times:

E has it *twice*, xxviii.5,6.

(xiii) וְעַתָּה, *vĕhattah*, 'and now,'—עַתָּה, *hattah*, 'now,' iii.22, iv.11, xi.6, xii.19, xx.7, xxi.23, xxiv.49, xxvii.3,8, xxx.30, xxxi.16,30,44,xxxii.10(11), xxxvii.20, xli.33, xliv.30,33, xlv.5,8, xlvii.4, l.5,17,21,—xix.9, xxii.12, xxvi.22,29, xxvii.36, xxix.32ᵇ,34ᵇ, xxxi.13,28,42, xxxii.4(5), xlvi.34,—*thirty-five* times:

E has וְעַתָּה, *once*, xlviii.5.

*(xiv) רָעָה, *rahah*, 'tend,' as a flock, iv.2, xiii.7,7,8,8, xxvi.20,20, xxix.7,9, xxx.31,36, xxxvi.24, xxxvii.2,12,13,16, xli.2,18, xlvi.32,34, xlvii.3, xlviii.15, xlix.24. —*twenty-three* times.

*(xv) גַּם־הוּא, *gam-hu*, 'he (she, it) also,' גַּם־אָנֹכִי, *gam-ănochi*, 'I also,' &c. iv.4,22,26, x.21, xix,38, xx.5, xxii.20,24, xxvii,31,34,38,45, xxx.3,30, xxxii.18(19), xliii.8,8, xliv.9,16, xlvi.34, xlvii.3, xlviii.19,19,—xx.6,6, xxix.27,33ᵉ, xxxv.17, xxxviii.10, xliv.10,29, xlviii.11,—*thirty-one* times.

*(xvi) עָשָׂה לְ־, *hasah lĕ*, 'do to,' ix.24, xii.18, xvi.6, xix.8,8,19, xx.9,9,13, xxi.6,23, xxii.12, xxvi.10,29, xxvii.37.45, xxix.25, xxx.31, xxxi.12, xlii.25,28, l.12,—*twenty-one* times.

*(xvii) 'Elohim of' Shem, ix.26, of heaven, xxiv.3,7, of earth, xxiv.3, of Abraham, xxiv.12,27,42,48, xxvi.24, xxviii.13, xxxi.42, xxxi.53, xxxii.9, of Isaac, xxviii.13, xxxii.9, xlvi.1,3, of Nahor, xxxi.53, of Israel, xxxiii.20;

*comp.* 'Dread of' Isaac, xxxi.42,53, 'thy (your) Elohim,' xxvii.20, xliii.23, 'El of' Bethel, xxxi.13, xxxv.7.

*(xviii) דָּבָר, *davar*, 'word, matter,' xi.1, xii.17, xv.1,4, xviii.14,25, xix.8,21,22. xx.8,10,11,18, xxi.11,26, xxii.1,16,20, xxiv.9,28,30,33,50,52,66, xxvii.34,42, xxix. 13, xxx.31,34, xxxi.1, xxxii.19(20), xxxiv.14,18,19, xxxvii.8,11,14, xxxix.7,17,19, 19, xli.28,32,37, xlii.16,20, xliii.7,18, xliv.2,6,7,7,10,18,24, xlv.27, xlvii.30, xlviii.1,— *fifty-nine* times:

E has the verb דָּבַר, *davar*, 'speak,' *eleven* times, which X also frequently uses.

*(xix) נָא, *na*, 'now, I pray, &c.' xii.11,13, xiii.8,9,14, xv.5, xvi.2,2, xviii.3,3,4, 21,27,30,31,32, xix.2.2,7,8,8,18,19,20,20, xxii.2, xxiv.2,12,14,17,23,42,43,45, xxv. 30, xxvi.28, xxvii.2,3,9,19,21,26, xxx.14,27, xxxi.12, xxxii.11(12),29(30), xxxiii.10, 10,11,14,15, xxxiv.8, xxxvii.6,14,16,32, xxxviii.16,25, xl.8,14, xliv.18,33, xlv.4, xlvii.4,29,29,29, xlviii.9, l.4,4,5,17,17,—*seventy-four* times:

E *never* uses נָא, but he has instead of it לוּ in a formula of entreaty, xxiii.5,13,14.

*(xx) כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ, *kol-ăsher-lo*, 'all which is his,' &c. xii.20, xiii.1, xiv.23,

xix.12, xx.7, xxiv.2,36, xxv.5, xxxi.1,21, xxxii.23(24), xxxiii.9,11, xxxix.4,5,5,6,8, xlv.10,11,xlvi.1,32,xlvii.1, *comp.* xxxii.7(8),xxxiii.15,xxxv.2,6,—*twenty-seven* times.

*(xxi) קוּם, *kum*, 'arise'=set out, xiii.17, xviii.16, xix.14,15, xxi.32, xxii.3,19, xxiv,10,54,61, xxv.34, xxvii.43, xxxi.17,21, xxxii.22(23), xxxv.3, xxxviii.19, xliii.8,15, xlvi.5,—*twenty* times:

E has it *once*, xxviii.2.

(xxii) נַעַר, *nahar*, 'youth,' *m.* and *f.*—נַעֲרָה, *nahărah*, 'damsel,' xiv.24, xviii.7, xix.4, xxi.12,17,17,18,19,20, xxii.3,5,5,12,19, xxv.27, xxxiv.19, xxxvii.2b, xli.12, xliii.8, xliv.22,30,31,32,33,33,34, xlviii.16.—xxiv.14,16,28,55,57,61, xxxiv.3,12,—*thirty-five* times.

*(xxiii) נָגַשׁ, *nagash*, 'come-near,' xviii.23,xix.9,9, xxvii.21,22,25,25,26,27, xxix. 10, xxxiii.3,6,7,7, xliii.19, xliv.18, xlv.4,4, xlviii.10,13,—*twenty* times.

*(xxiv) 'thy servant,' 'your servant,' &c. xviii.3,5, xix.2,19, xxiv.14, xxvi.24, xxxii.4,10,18,20, xxxiii.5,14, xlii.10,11,13, xliii.28, xliv.7,9,16,18,18,19,21,23,24, 27,30,31,31,32,33, xlvi.34, xlvii.3,4,4, l.17,—*thirty-six* times.

*(xxv) חֲלוֹם, *khalam*, *v.* חֲלוֹם, *khălom*, *n.* 'dream,' xx.3,6, xxviii.12, xxxi.10,11,24, xxxvii.5,5,6,6,8,9,9,9,9,10,10,19,20, xl.5,5,5,5,8,8,9,9,16, xli.1,5,7,8,11,11,11,11,12, 12,15,15,15,17,22,25,26,32, xlii.9,9,—*forty-eight* times.

*(xxvi) 'Israel,' used as a *personal* name for Jacob, xxxv.21,22,22, xxxvii.3,13, xlii.5, xliii.6,8,11, xlv.21,28, xlvi.1,2,5,29,30, xlvii.29,31, xlviii.2,8,10,11,13,14,21, xlix.2,24, l.2,—*twenty-nine* times.

*(xxvii) the *time of day* defined, *viz.* 'morning,' xix.27, xx.8, xxi.14, xxii.3, xxiv. 54, xxvi.31, xxviii.18, 'evening,' viii.11, xix.1, xxiv.11,63, xxix.23, xxx.16, xlix.27, 'daybreak,' xix.1,5, xxxii.24,26, xliv.3, 'sunrise,' xix.23, xxxii.31, 'noon,' xliii.16,25, 'heat of the day,' xviii.1, 'afternoon,' xxix.7, 'cool of the day,' iii.8, 'sunset,' xv. 12,17, xxviii.11, 'night,' xiv.15, xix.5,33,34,35, xx.3, xxvi.24, xxx.15,16, xxxi.24, xxxii.13,21,22, xl.5, xli.11, xlvi.2,—*forty-four* times.

31. A consideration of the above phenomena alone will probably suffice to convince the reader that we have here the indications of a writer or writers very different from the Elohist. As before, it is by no means maintained that all these formulæ are of equal importance, or that they are in such a sense characteristic of the non-Elohistic matter, that, whenever we find any one of them occurring in any other part of the Pentateuch, we may at once decide *against* the Elohistic origin of the passage in question. On the contrary, some of them, as we have noted, are used by the Elohist in Genesis itself. Thus (iv),(viii),(x),(xiii),(xx), are each used *once* by E in Genesis, (xii) *twice*, (iii) *thrice*; and, though (i) 'serve,' 'servant,' and (xviii), 'word,' do not occur with him, yet he has

used the cognate words, 'service' and 'speak,' the former in Exodus, the latter in Genesis.

32. But most of the formulæ in (30) never occur at all in E, as, on the contrary, most of those in (26) never occur at all in X. In short, when we have before us the following facts,—

(i) That there are *thirty-two* formulæ (26)—omitting (ix) and (xxxiv)—which occur each on an average *ten* times in E, (equivalent to *thirty-five* times in X), of which *twenty-nine* do *not occur at all* in X, two occur *once*, and one *twice*,—

(ii) That there are also *twenty-seven* formulæ (30), which occur each on an average *forty-seven* times in X, (equivalent to *thirteen* times in E,) of which *twenty* do *not occur at all* in E, five occur *once*, one *twice*, another *thrice*,—

it seems impossible to doubt that there exists a distinct difference in style between these two parts of Genesis.

33. Who can suppose, for instance, that *one and the same writer* would have used in X the very common word עַתָּה, *hattah*, 'now,' or וְעַתָּה, *vĕhattah*, 'and now,' *thirty-six* times (30.xiii), and only *once* in E,—that in three-fourths of Genesis he would have thrown in the little particle, גַּם, *gam*, 'also,' so frequently, that it occurs *eight* times in *each* of two chapters, xxiv,xxxii, and in X altogether *ninety-two* times (30.viii), and yet would have used it only *once* in the rest of the Book,—that he would have employed in X אָנֹכִי, *ănochi*, for 'I,' *fifty-four* times, and אֲנִי, *ăni*, *thirty* times (30.x), and in E have reversed the proportions, and used אֲנִי, *seven* times (=*twenty-four* times in X) and אָנֹכִי only *once*,—הוּא, *hu*, 'he, she, it,' a *hundred and twenty-eight* times in X (30.iii), and only *once* in E, and גַּם־הוּא, *gam-hu*, and its correlatives, *thirty-one* times in X (30.xv), and in E not at all?

34. It is still more inconceivable that the little particle of entreaty נָא, *na*, could have been used by the *same* writer *eight* times in each of xviii and xxiv, *nine* times in xix, and *seventy-four* times in X altogether (30.xix), and *not at all* in E,—not even in xxiii, where Abraham throughout uses forms of courteous entreaty, yet never employs this particle, nor even the phrase 'find favour in your eyes,' which occurs, as we shall see presently (35.xxiii), repeatedly (*thirteen* times) in X. It

cannot be said that these expressions were too *vulgar* and *common-place*, to be put in the mouth of Elohim in xvii or even in that of Abraham in xxiii. For in X the latter phrase is used in words addressed to the angel, xix.19, and נָא in those addressed to Jehovah, xviii.27,30,31,32, &c.,—nay, in the words ascribed to Jehovah Himself, xiii.14, xv.5, xviii.21, &c.

35. We shall now, however, extend our list by including those formulæ, which occur from *ten* to *twenty* times in the non-Elohistic parts of Genesis, but not even once in E.

*(i) טֶרֶם, *terem*, 'not yet,' ii.5,5, xix.4, xxiv.15,45, xxvii.4,33, xxxvii.18, xli.50, xlv.28.

*(ii) 'face of the *ground*,' ii.6, iv.14, vi.1,7, vii.4,23ᵃ, viii.8,13ᵇ;
*comp.* 'families of the ground,' xii.3, xxviii.14; 'into this ground,' xxviii.15.

*(iii) 'pleasant (good) of appearance,' 'good (evil) of form,' &c. ii.9, xii.11, xxiv.16, xxix.17, xxxix.6, xli.2,3,4,4,18,19,21.

*(iv) לְבַד, *lĕvad*, 'apart,' ii.18, xxi.28,29, xxvi.1, xxx.40, xxxii.16(17),24(25), xliii.32,32,32, xliv.20, xlvi.26, xlvii.26.

*(v) פַּעַם, *paham*, 'time,' ii.23, xviii.32, xxvii.36, xxix.34ᵇ,35ᵇ, xxx.20ᵇ, xxxiii.3, xli.32, xliii.10, xlvi.30.

*(vi) עָזַב, *hazav*, 'leave, forsake,' ii.24, xxiv.27, xxviii.15, xxxix.6,12,13,15,18, xliv.22,22, l.8.

*(vii) 'hearken to the voice of,' iii.8,10,17, iv.23, xvi.2, xxi.12,17,17, xxii.18, xxvi.5, xxvii.8,13,43, xxx.6ᵇ, *comp.* iv.10, xlv.16.

*(viii) 'what is this?' 'what is this thou hast done?' 'what hast thou done?' iii.13, iv.10, xii.18, xx.9,10, xxvi.10, xxvii.20, xxix.25, xxxi.26, xlii.28, xliv.15.

*(ix) 'do this,' 'do this thing,' iii.14, xx.10, xxi.26, xxii.16, xxx.31, xxxiv.14,19, xlii.18, xliii.11, xlv.17,19.

*(x) 'curse,' iii.14,17, iv.11, v.29, viii.21, ix.25, xii.3,3, xxvii.12,13,29,29, xlix.7.

*(xi) בַּעֲבוּר, *bahăvur*, 'because of,' iii.17, viii.21, xviii.29,31,32, xxi.30, xxvi.24, xxvii.4,19, xlvi.34.

*(xii) 'add to bear'=bear again, 'add to give,' &c. iv.2,12, viii.10,12,21,21, xviii.29, xxxvii.5,8, xxxviii.5,26, xliv.23, *comp.* xxv.1.

*(xiii) מִנְחָה, *minkhah*, 'offering,' iv.3,4,5, xxxii.13(14),18(19),20(21),21(22), xxxiii.10, xliii.11,15,25,26.

*(xiv) 'be kindled (*viz.* anger) to,' iv.5,6, xviii.30,32, xxx.2, xxxi.35,36, xxxiv.7, xxxix.19, xliv.18, xlv.5.

*(xv) חָטָא, *khata*, 'sin,' and its cognates, iv.7, xiii.13, xviii.20, xx.6,9,9, xxxi.36,39, xxxix.9, xl.1, xli.9, xlii.22, xliii.9, xliv.32, l.17.

*(xvi) הָרַג, *harag*, 'slay,' iv.8,14,15,23,25, xii.12, xxvi.7, xxvii.41,42, xxxiv.25,26, xxxvii.20,26, xlix.6.

*(xvii) הַיּוֹם, *hayyom*, 'this day,' iv.14, xxi.8,26, xxii.14, xxiv.12,42, xxv.31,33, xxx.32, xxxi.43,48, xxxix.11, xl.7, xli.9, xlii.13,32, xlvii.23, l.20.

*(xviii) הִכָּה, *hikkah*, 'smite,' iv.15, viii.21, xiv.5,7,15,17, xix.11, xxxii.8(9), 11(12), xxxiv.30, xxxvi.35[c], xxxvii.21.

*(xix) יָלַד, *yalad*, 'beget,' iv.18,18,18,22, vi.4, x.8,13,15,24,24,26, xxii.23, xxv.3.

*(xx) יֶלֶד, *yeled*, 'lad,' יַלְדָה, *yaldah*, 'lass,' iv.23, xxi.8,14,15,16, xxx.26, xxxii.22(23), xxxiii.1,2,2,5,5,6,7,13,14, xxxiv.4, xxxvii.30.

*(xxi) הֶחֱל, *hekhel*, 'begin,' iv.26, vi.1, ix.20, x.8, xi.6, xli.54, xliv.12;
*comp.* בַּתְּחִלָּה, *battĕkhillah*, 'in the beginning,' xiii.3, xli.21, xliii.18,20.

*(xxii) רַק, *rak*, 'only,' vi.5, xiv.24, xix.8, xx.11, xxiv.8, xxvi.29, xli.40, xlvii.22,26, l.8.

*(xxiii) 'find favour in the eyes of,' vi.8, xviii.3, xix.19, xxx.27, xxxii.5, xxxiii. 8,10,15, xxxiv.11, xxxix.4, xlvii.25,29, l.4, *comp.* xxxix.21.

*(xxiv) סוּר, *sur*, 'turn-aside,' viii.13[b], xix.2,3, xxx.32,35, xxxv.2, xxxviii.14,19, xli.42, xlviii.17, xlix.10.

*(xxv) 'build (set-up, make) an altar,' viii.20, xii.7,8, xiii.4,18, xxii.9,9, xxvi. 25, xxxiii.20, xxxv.1,3,7.

*(xxvi) 'tent,' ix.21, xii.8, xiii.3,12[b],18, xviii.1,6,9, xxiv.67, xxvi.25, xxxi.25,33, xxxiii.19, xxxv.21, *comp.* xxvi.17, xxxiii.18.

*(xxvii) 'in the land of his kindred,' xi.28, 'out of thy land and out of thy kindred,' xii.1, 'unto my land and unto my kindred,' xxiv.4, 'out of the land of my kindred,' xxiv.7, 'unto the land of thy fathers and to thy kindred,' xxxi.3, 'unto the land of thy kindred,' xxxi.13, 'to thy land and to thy kindred,' xxxii.9.

*(xxviii) 'my (thy, our, his, her) father's house,' xii.1, xx.13, xxiv.7,23,38,40, xxviii.21, xxxi.14,30, xxxiv.19, xxxviii.11,11, xli.51, xlvi.31,31, xlvii.12, l.8,22.

*(xxix) גָּדַל, *gadal*, 'grow-great,' xii.2, xix.13,19, xxi.8,20, xxiv.35, xxv.27, xxvi.13, xxxviii.11,14, xli.40, xlviii.19,19.

*(xxx) כָּבֵד, *kaved*, 'be weighty,' and its cognates, xii.10, xiii.2, xviii.20, xxxi.1, xxxiv.19, xli.31, xliii.1, xlv.13, xlvii. 4,13, xlviii.10, xlix.6, l.9,10,11.

*(xxxi) 'flocks and herds,' xii.16, xiii.5, xx.14, xxi.27, xxiv.35, xxxii.7(8), xxxiii. 13, xxxiv.28, xlv.10, xlvi.32, xlvii.1, l.8, *comp.* xxvi.14, xxx.43, xxxii.5, xlvii.17.

*(xxxii) 'and he (they) called to (לְ, *lĕ*),' xii.18, xix.5, xx.8,9, xxiv.58, xxvi.9, xxvii.42, xxxi.4,54, xxxix.14, xlvi.33.

*(xxxiii) 'lift up the eyes and see,' xiii.10,14, xviii.2, xxii.4,13, xxiv.63,64, xxxi.10,12, xxxiii.1,5, xxxvii.25, xliii.29; *comp.* 'lift up the feet and go,' xxix.1[b].

*(xxxiv) 'go (go forth, come, rise, run) to meet,' xiv.17, xviii.2, xix.1, xxiv.17, 65,xxix.13, xxx.16, xxxii.6(7), xxxiii.4,xlvi.29; *comp.* 'meet,' xv.10,xlii.4,38,xlix.1.

*(xxxv) 'in that day,'—'in that night,' xv.18, xxvi.32, xxx.35, xxxiii.16, xlviii.20,—xix.33,35, xxx.16, xxxii.13,21,22.

*(xxxvi) 'lie with' carnally, xix.32,33,34,34,35, xxvi.10, xxx.15,16, xxxiv.2,7, xxxv.22, xxxix.7,12,14.

*(xxxvii) אוּלַי, *ulai*, 'perhaps,' xvi.2, xviii.24,28,29,30,31,32, xxiv.5,39, xxvii.12, xxxii.20(21), xliii.12.

*(xxxviii) בּוֹא, *bo*, 'go-in,' used of sexual intercourse, xvi.4, xix.31,33, xxix.21,23,30, xxx.3,4ᵇ,16, xxxviii.2,8,9,16,16,18;

*(xxxix) מַלְאָךְ, *malach*, 'angel, messenger,' xvi.7,9,10,11, xix.1,15, xxi.17, xxii.11,15, xxiv.7,40, xxviii.12, xxxi.11, xxxii.1(2),3(4),6(7), xlviii.16.

*(xl) רוּץ, *ruts*, 'run,' xviii.2,7, xxiv.17,20,28,29, xxix.12,13, xxxiii.4, xli.14.

*(xli) מִהֵר, *miher*, 'hasten,' xviii.6,6,7, xix.22, xxiv.18,20,46, xxvii.20, xli.32, xliii.30, xliv.11, xlv.9,13.

*(xlii) אִם־לֹא, *im-lo*, 'if not,' xviii.21, xxiv.8,21,38,41,49, xxvii.21, xxxiv.17, xxxvii.32, xlii,16,37.

*(xliii) 'mercy,' 'do mercy,' xix.19, xx.13, xxi.23, xxiv.12,14,27,49, xxxii.10(11), xxxix.21, xl.14, xlvii.29, *comp.* 'mercy and truth,' xxiv.27,49, xxxii.10, xlvii.29.

*(xliv) 'lift-up the voice and weep,' xxi.16, xxvii.38, xxix.11, *comp.* xxxix.14 15,18, xlv.2;

'fall on the neck and weep,' xxxiii.4, xlv.14,14, xlvi.29,29, *comp.* xlv.15.

*(xlv) Elohim (Jehovah) 'with thee,' 'with him,' &c. xxi.22, xxvi.3,24,28, xxviii.15,20, xxxi.3,5,42, xxxv.3, xxxix.2,3,21,23, xlvi.4,4, xlviii.21, l.24.

*(xlvi) 'sweaṙ,' xxi.23,24,31, xxii.16, xxiv.3,7,9,37, xxv.33,33, xxvi.3,31, xxxi.53, xlvii.31,31, l.5,6,24,25, *comp.* xiv.22; 'oath,' xxiv.8,41,41, xxvi.3,28.

*(xlvii) אָהַב, *ahav*, 'love,' xxii.2, xxiv.67, xxv.28,28, xxvii.4,9,14, xxix.18,20, 30,32ᵈ, xxxiv.3, xxxvii.3,4, xliv.20;

*comp.* שָׂנֵא, *sane*, 'hate,' xxiv.60, xxvi.27, xxix.31,33ᵇ, xxxvii.4,5,8.

*(xlviii) 'at his seeing,' 'at his hearing,' &c., xxiv.30,30, xxvii.34, xxix.13, xxxiv.7, xxxviii.29, xxxix.10,13,15,19, xliv.30,31.

*(xlix) בֶּגֶד, *beged*, 'vestment,' xxiv.53, xxvii.15,27, xxviii.20, xxxvii.29, xxxviii. 14,19, xxxix.12,12,13,15,16,18, xli.42.

*(l) 'Elohim of my (thy, his, your, their) father,' xxvi.24, xxviii.13, xxxi.5,29, 42,53, xxxii.9(10), xliii.23, xlvi.1,3, xlix.25, l.17.

*(li) 'kiss,' xxvii.26,27, xxix.11,13, xxxi.28,55, xxxiii.4, xli.40, xlv.15, xlviii.10, l.1; *comp.* 'embrace,' xxix.13, xxxiii.4, xlviii.10.

*(lii) 'bread' = food, xxviii.20, xxxi.54, xxxvii.25, xxxix.6, xlii.54,55, xliii.25, 31,32, xlvii.13,15,17,17,19.

*(liii) 'steal,' xxx.33, xxxi.19,20,26,27,30,32,39, xl.15,15. xliv.8.

*(liv) 'see the face of,' xxxi.2,5, xxxii.20, xxxiii.10,10, xliii.3,5, xliv.23,26, xlvi.30, xlviii.11; *comp.* xxxii.30.

36. We may add also the following formulæ, which, though not occurring so frequently, are yet peculiar, and characterise the matter in X as distinct in respect of authorship from E.

*(i) 'good and (or) evil,' ii.9,17, iii.5,22, xxiv.50, xxxi.24,29.

*(ii) הִפָּרֵד, *hippared*, 'be separated,' ii.10, x.5,32, xiii.9,11,14, xxv.23; *comp.* xxx.40.

*(iii) 'thou (pron.) knowest,' 'ye (pron.) know,' &c. xviii.19, xx.6, xxx.26,29, xxxi.6, xliv.27; *comp.* xii.11, xxii.12.

*(iv) various adverbial phrases:—

(α) בִּלְתִּי, *bilti*, 'except,' iii.11, iv.15, xix.21, xxi.26, xxxviii.9, xliii.3, xlvii.18;

(β) בַּעַד, *baʿad*, 'behind,' vii.16ᵇ, xx.7,18, xxvi.8;

(γ) לְמַעַן, *lĕmaʿan*, 'in order that,' xii.13, xviii.19,19,24, xxvii.25, xxxvii.22, l.20;

(δ) בִּגְלָל, *biglal*, 'for the sake of,' xii.13, xxx.27, xxxix.5;

(ε) עַל־דְּבַר, h*al-dĕvar*, 'because of,' xii.17, xxii.16, xliii.18;

(ζ) בִּלְעֲדֵי, *bilʿădê*, 'beside,' xiv.24, xli.16,44;

(η) חָלִילָה, *khalilah*, 'profane!' xviii.25,25, xliv.7,17;

(θ) עַל־אוֹדֹת, h*al-odoth*, 'on account of,' xxi.11,25, xxvi.32.

*(v) 'be greater than,' iv.13,xxxix.9 xli.40, xlviii.19, 'be more wonderful than,' xviii.14, 'be stronger than,' xxvi.16, 'be less than,' xxxii.10.

*(vi) 'call upon the name of Jehovah,' iv.26, xii.8, xiii.4, xxi.33, xxvi.25.

*(vii) נֹחַם, *nikhem*, 'comfort,' v.29, vi.6,7, xxiv.67, xxvii.42, xxxvii.35, xxxviii.12, l.21.

*(viii) 'at thy going to' Gerar, x.19, to Sodom, x.19, to Sephar, x.30, to Zoar, xiii.10, to Asshur, xxv.18.

*(ix) 'Sodom and Gomorrah,' x.19, xiii.10, xiv.2,8,10,11, xviii.20, xix.24,28.

*(x) הָבָה, *havah*, הָבוּ, *havu*, 'give-here!' xi.3,4,7, xxix.21, xxx.1ᵉ, xxxviii.16, xlvii.15,16.

*(xi) 'by thee shall all families of the ground be blessed,' xii.3, xxviii.14;
'by him shall all nations of the earth be blessed,' xviii.18;
'by thy seed shall all nations of the earth be blessed,' xxii.18, xxvi.4;
'by thee shall Israel bless,' xlviii.20.

*(xii) 'pitch-tent,' 'move-tent,' xii.8, xiii.12ᵇ,18, xxvi.25, xxxi.25, xxxiii.19, xxxv.21.

*(xiii) 'behold! I pray,' xii.11, xvi.2, xviii.27,31, xix.2,8,19,20, xxvii.2.

*(xiv) 'is not the whole land before thee?' xiii.9;
*comp.* 'my land is before thee,' xx.15;
'the land shall be before you,' xxxiv.10;
'the land is broad on both hands before them,' xxxiv.21;
'the land of Egypt is before thee,' xlvii.6.

*(xv) אַל־נָא, *al-na*, 'let not, I pray,' xiii.8, xviii.3,30,32, xix.7,18, xxxiii.10, xlvii.29.

*(xvi) רְאֵה, *rĕch*, רְאוּ, *reu*, 'see!' xiii.14, xxvii.27, xxxi.12,50, xxxix.14, xli.41.

*(xvii) 'I will place thy seed as the dust of the earth, so that, if a man shall be able to count the dust of the earth, thy seed also shall be counted,' xiii.16;
'tell the stars, if thou art able to count them . . . so shall thy seed be,' xv.5;
'I will surely multiply thy seed, and it shall not be counted for multitude,' xvi.10;

'I will surely multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, and as the sand which is on the lip of the sea,' xxii.17;

'I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven,' xxvi.4;

'I will multiply thy seed,' xxvi.24;

'thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth,' xxviii.14;

'I will place thy seed as the sand of the sea, which cannot be counted for multitude,' xxxii.12;

'and they shall swarm-as-fish for multitude,' xlviii.16.

*(xviii) 'fear not,' xv.1, xxi.17, xxvi.24, xxxv.17, xliii.23, xlvi.3, l.19,21.

*(xix) 'cut a covenant,' xv.18, xxi.27,32, xxvi.28, xxxi.44.

*(xx) 'bow to the earth,'—'bow with the face to the earth,' xviii.2, xxiv.52, xxxiii.3, xxxvii.10, xliii.26,—xix.1, xlii.6, xlviii.12.

*(xxi) 'if, I pray, I have found favour in thine eyes,' xviii.3, xxx.27, xxxiii.10, xlvii.29, l.4.

*(xxii) 'a little water,' xviii.4, xxiv.17,43, 'a little food,' xliii.2, xliv.25, 'a little balm, a little honey,' xliii.11.

*(xxiii) 'according to (this word) these words,' xviii.25, xxiv.28, xxxii.19, xxxix.17,19, xliv.7, *comp.* xxx.34, xliii.7, xliv.10, xlvii.30.

*(xxiv) 'rise-early in the morning,' xix.27, xx.8, xxi.14, xxii.3,xxvi.31, xxviii.18, xxxi.55, *comp.* xxiv.54.

*(xxv) 'unto this day,' xix.37,38, xxvi.33, xxxii.32, xxxv.20$^{b}$, xlvii.26, xlviii.15.

(xxvi) 'behold, I die (thou diest)!' xx.3, xlviii.21, l.5, *comp.* xxx.1$^{c}$, l.24.

*(xxvii) 'and it came to pass after these things,' xxii.1,20, xxxix.7, xl.1, xlviii.1, *comp.* xv.1.

*(xxviii) 'and it was told to' Abraham, xxii.20, to Rebekah, xxvii.42, to Laban, xxxi.22, to Tamar, xxxviii.13, to Judah, xxxviii.24, *comp.* xlviii.2.

*(xxix) הַכֵּיר, *hikkir*, 'discern,' xxvii.23, xxxi.32, xxxvii.32,33, xxxviii.25,26, xlii.7,7,8,8.

*(xxx) טַף, *taph*, 'little-ones,' xxxiv.29, xliii.8, xlv.19, xlvi.5, xlvii.12,24, l.8,21.

*(xxxi) 'live and not die,' xlii.2, xliii.8, xlvii.19.

# CHAPTER V.

## DIFFERENCES AND DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE ELOHISTIC AND NON-ELOHISTIC PORTIONS OF GENESIS.

37. The reader has now had placed before him, as we suppose, sufficient evidence to satisfy him that the Elohistic passages in Genesis are essentially distinct in style and tone from the remaining parts of the Book, and cannot possibly be ascribed to the same author. We have here more than a *hundred* different formulæ, each of which on an average occurs more than *ten* times in Genesis, but only in those portions of it which remain, when the Elohistic passages are removed. They *cover*, however, *the whole ground* which is then left, two or three of them often occurring in one and the same verse.

38. On the other hand, these formulæ, with a curious accuracy, pass by all those sections, which we have shown to belong to E; and these last in their turn exhibit also their own peculiar phraseology, which we never find repeated in the rest of Genesis. Thus in the whole Elohistic story of the Creation, *thirty-four* verses,—in that of the Deluge, *thirty-five* verses,—in the blessing on Noah, *seventeen* verses,—in that on Abraham, *twenty-seven* verses,—in the account of the purchase of the field of Machpelah, *twenty* verses,—in short, in the whole connected story down to the death of Abraham, xxv.8, more than *two hundred* verses,—not one of these hundred formulæ, marked with the asterisk, even once occurs, while the characteristics of E, as noted in (26), occur repeatedly; whereas in the

remainder of Genesis the former fall, as it were, exactly into the very *mould* which is left by the removal of the Elohistic narrative, and the latter are wanting altogether.

39. It would seem to be impossible to resist the force of the above evidence. It may be said, perhaps, that the difference observed may be partly due to the difference of *subjects* treated of, as well as to a difference of authorship. And this, of course, is true to some extent. Thus the scenes of family life described in xviii,xix,xxiv,xxvii,xxx,xxxi,xxxvii–l, have no doubt helped to multiply the use of some of the formulæ, which recur so frequently in these parts of Genesis. Still, it is the *author*, who chooses to introduce these subjects, and who delights to expatiate upon them, describing minutely the little incidents of common daily life, and expressing them by lively and picturesque phrases, which give everywhere so much animation and spirit to his narrative, and distinguish it from the grave and sober style of the Elohist.

40. Thus it is only in the non-Elohistic portions of Genesis that we meet with such expressions as 'lift-up the eyes and see,' 'lift-up the feet and go,' 'lift-up the voice and weep,' 'fall upon the neck and weep,'—'do mercy to,' 'mercy and truth,' 'be kindled to,' 'find favour in the eyes of,' 'see the face of,'—'go to meet,' 'rise to meet,' 'run to meet,'—'sin,' 'swear,' 'steal,' 'smite,' 'slay,' 'fear,' 'hate,' 'comfort,' 'embrace,' 'kiss,' and even 'love.' In one word, this part of the narrative abounds with tender touches of human nature and expressions of strong emotion—

Praise, blame, love, kisses, tears, and smiles.

And, a subject having been introduced once, which required the use of such formulæ, we soon meet here with some other subject of the same class, which requires the use of similar formulæ. If there is ill-will between Cain and Abel, so also is there between Lot's herdsmen and Abraham's, Abraham's and Abimelech's, Isaac's and Abimelech's,—between Sarah and Hagar, Ishmael and Isaac, Esau and Jacob, Jacob and Laban,

Leah and Rachel, Joseph and his brethren. If Abraham 'loves' Isaac, so, too, does Isaac 'love' Rebekah, 'love' Esau, 'love' savoury-meat,—and Rebekah 'loves' Jacob, Jacob 'loves' Rachel, Israel 'loves' Joseph, Shechem 'loves' Dinah.

41. In this way some common phrase is repeated continually, in these parts of Genesis, while it is wholly wanting in E. Such an expression *might* have been used by the Elohist, and probably would be found used by him, whenever the occasion required it. But his habits of thought kept him from introducing freely such topics as required this frequent employment of it. Yet we can hardly say even so much as this of *every* common formula, which is found repeated again and again in the non-Elohistic passages. Thus the use of the little particle of entreaty נָא, which occurs *seventy-four* times in these passages, eight or nine times in the course of a single chapter, seems to have been altogether alien to the style of E; since, as already observed (34), he does not even employ it once, nor the phrase 'if I have found favour in thine (your) eyes,' in describing Abraham's entreaty for the cave of Machpelah.

42. But we may draw attention more particularly to the following strong points of contrast between the Elohistic matter and the rest of Genesis.

(i) E uses *always* 'Jacob,' as the personal name of the Patriarch, even after having recorded the giving of the name 'Israel,' xxxv.14,15,20,22$^{b}$,23,26,27,29, xxxvi.6, xxxvii.1,2$^{a}$, xlvii.7,7,8,9,10,28,28, xlviii.3, xlix.1$^{a}$,33.

In X we find (*twenty-nine* times) 'Israel' (30.xxvi).

(ii) E never speaks of 'angels,' 'dreams,' or 'visions of the night,'—'altars' or 'sacrifices,'—'oaths' or 'curses,'—all which are peculiar to X (30.xxv, 35.xxv, 36.vi, 35.xlvi,x).

(iii) E uses only (*eleven* times) שִׁפְחָה, *shiphkhah*, for 'maid,' never אָמָה, *amah*, which occurs (*seven* times) in X, xx.17, xxi.10,10,12,13, xxx.3, xxxi.33, as does also שִׁפְחָה, (*twelve* times).

(iv) E uses only (*sixty-one* times) הוֹלִיד, *holid*, for 'he begat' (26.v); whereas in X we have always (*thirteen* times) יָלַד, *yalad*, (35.xxi).

(v) E speaks only of the 'cities of the circuit' of Jordan, xiii.12, xix.29, but does not name them: in X we never find the above expression, but 'Sodom and Gomorrah' are named repeatedly, (36.ix).

(vi) E has always 'establish' or 'give' a covenant, *nine* times (25.xiii): whereas in X we find only 'cut' a covenant, *five* times (36.xix).

(vii) E knows of no rivalry or ill-blood between Esau and Jacob: whereas in X, as we have observed (40), bitter feelings are described as existing, not only between these especially, but also between several other pairs of personages in the history.

(viii) E describes repeatedly the property of the patriarchs (26.xx) by means of the phrase 'all the gain (wealth) which they had gotten,' instead of which we find in X the expression 'flocks and herds' used habitually in this connection (35.xxxi).

(ix) E, in his formulæ of blessing, uses frequently the expression 'fructify (be mighty) and multiply', *twelve* times (26.iii), which never occurs in X, where we find the progeny of Abraham, &c. likened for number to the 'dust of the earth,' the 'stars of the heaven,' 'the sand of the sea,' the swarms of 'fishes,' which 'cannot be counted for multitude,' (36.xvii)—comparisons which are never made in E.

(x) E dwells upon the fact that '*many* nations' and 'kings' shall come from the loins of Abraham and Jacob (26.xxiv,xxv): whereas in X we read of *one* great nation, that should be born from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and once of *two* nations that should spring from Isaac (26.xxiv.N.B.).

(xi) E speaks only of the '*land of Canaan*'—'the land of *their sojournings*,' which should be given to Abraham &c., and to 'their seed *after them*' (26.xvii,xxvi): whereas in X these two phrases (italicised) are never used, and the promised land is extended to the banks of the Euphrates, xv.18.

(xii) E, while employing his own peculiar formulæ, as registered in (26), yet never uses the following remarkable expressions of X,(30.xvii, 35.xlv,l,36.xi):—

(α) the 'Elohim of' heaven, earth, Shem, Abraham, &c. (*twenty-four* times);

(β) 'Elohim (Jehovah) is *with thee*,' 'I will be *with thee*,' &c. (*eighteen* times);

(γ) 'the Elohim of my (thy, his, your, their) father, (*twelve* times);

(δ) 'by thee shall families of the ground be blessed,' &c. (*six* times).

The last of these formulæ is so striking that it is impossible to believe that the Elohist would not have used it somewhere—either in the blessing on Abraham, xvii.4-8,16,19, or in that on Jacob, xxxv.11,12,—if he had been acquainted with it.

43. We may observe also how frequently in X we meet with very strong anthropomorphic expressions, ascribing human actions, passions, and affections to the Deity.

Thus Jehovah is spoken of as—

(i) forming the man of dust out of the ground, ii.7;

(ii) breathing into his nostrils, ii.7;

(iii) planting a garden, ii.8;

(iv) taking the man and leaving him in the garden, ii.15;

(v) reasoning within Himself, ii.18, iii.22, vi.3,7, viii.21, ix.6,7, xviii.17,19;

(vi) bringing the birds and beasts to Adam, ii.19;

(vii) desiring to see what he would call them, ii.19;

(viii) taking out one of the man's ribs, ii.21;

(ix) closing up the flesh in its place, ii.21;
(x) making the rib into a woman, ii.22;
(xi) bringing the woman unto the man, ii.22;
(xii) walking in the breeze of the day, iii.8;
(xiii) making a sound as He walks, iii.8;
(xiv) missing the man, and calling for him, iii.9;
(xv) questioning him as to what he had done, iii.11;
(xvi) making coats of skins, iii.21;
(xvii) clothing the man and woman, iii.21;
(xviii) grudging the man being like Himself, iii.22;
(xix) refusing to let him eat of the tree of life, iii.22;
(xx) driving the man and woman out of the garden, iii.24;
(xxi) taking precautions to prevent their return to it, iii.24;
(xxii) showing respect to Abel and not to Cain, iv.4,5;
(xxiii) expostulating with Cain, iv.6,7;
(xxiv) questioning Cain, iv.9;
(xxv) setting a mark on Cain, iv.15;
(xxvi) repenting and being grieved at His heart, vi.6,7;
(xxvii) shutting up the Ark after Noah, vii.16$^{b}$;
(xxviii) smelling a sweet savour, viii.21;
(xxix) coming-down to see the city and tower of Babel, xi.5;
(xxx) eating bread and meat, xviii.8, *comp.* v.2,10,13,22, and xix.1;
(xxxi) rebuking Sarah's laughter, xviii.13;
(xxxii) expostulating with Sarah, xviii.15;
(xxxiii) going-down to see how matters were in Sodom, xviii.20,21;
(xxxiv) allowing Abraham to expostulate with Him, xviii.23–32;
(xxxv) going His way, xviii.33;
(xxxvi) tempting Abraham.

E speaks of Elohim 'remembering' Noah, Abraham, &c., making a covenant and appointing a sign of it, 'going-up' from Abraham, xvii.22, and from Jacob, xxxv.13. But these expressions—except perhaps, the last—are obviously very different in kind from the above.

44. The Elohist, in short, appears, as we have said (IV.82), to have had much more correct views of the nature of the Divine Being and of His paternal relations to mankind, than those entertained by the Jehovist; contrast the whole tone of the E. account of the creation, i.1–ii.4$^{a}$, with that of ii.4$^{b}$–25. And, we may add, he had far less gloomy views of life, of the prospects of the human race, and of the conditions under which

they are placed. Thus, having described in very simple, but grand and impressive, language the work of the Creation, he says that—

'Elohim saw all that He had made, and behold! it was very good,' i.31.

And so, according to this writer, the *Sabbath* was instituted, ii.1–3, a day of rest and refreshment for man and beast, in remembrance of Elohim's resting 'from all the work which He had created and made.'

45. At the end of 2000 years, however, a grievous change had passed over the scene:—

'The earth was corrupted before Elohim, and the earth was filled with violence; and Elohim saw the earth, and behold! it was corrupted; for all flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth,' vi.12.

And then he describes the judgment of the Flood, when—

'All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died, and Noah only was left, and they that were with him in the Ark,' vii.22,23$^{b}$.

The Elohist, therefore, manifestly had a deep sense of sin and its consequences. Yet still, after this, once more in *his* story is the blessing renewed, as at first,—

'Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth,' ix.1,7.

No curse is passed upon the earth, no woe inflicted permanently, on man in respect of the labours of the field, or on woman in regard to the pains of childbirth. An 'everlasting covenant' is made with man, and with 'every living creature of all flesh,' that no such judgment should ever again be inflicted upon the earth. As a sign of this covenant the bright bow of Elohim is set in the sky. Into man's hand are all things given; only blood, 'which is the life,' shall not be eaten, ix.2–4. Though man has greatly sinned, and 'corrupted his way,' and 'filled the earth with violence,' yet still is he reminded that he is 'made in the image of Elohim,' and therefore his life is awfully sacred,—

'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of Elohim made He man,' ix.6.

46. In short the Elohist knows nothing about the garden of Eden, the forbidden fruit, the wily serpent, the whole story of the Fall, by which, as Dr. THOMAS BURNET says, *Arch. Phil. p.* 295,—

> The work elaborated through six days, and that by the Hand of Omnipotence, was destroyed by the infamous beast in so many hours.

It is only the Jehovist, who multiplies 'curses,' and regards the work of agriculture and the pains of childbirth as the bitter consequences of our first parents' sin. It is only he that speaks of the 'sweat of the brow,' the very privilege and pledge of human health and happiness, as only to be considered a sign of his degradation, a token of his guilt and shame.

47. And, in accordance with the above, it is the Jehovist who gives us all the *darkest* parts of the histories of individual life. While no stain of moral weakness is attached by the older writer to the character of any one of the three patriarchs, in the other parts of Genesis we find each of them exhibited as grievously faulty in some particular. It is here only that we meet with incidents such as these.

(i) the disobedience of Adam and Eve, iii.6;
(ii) the murderous jealousy of Cain, iv.8;
(iii) the violence of Lamech, iv.23,24;
(iv) the intercourse of angels with the 'daughters of men,' vi.2,4;
(v) the drunkenness of Noah, ix.21;
(vi) the irreverence of Ham, ix.21,22,24;
(vii) the presumption of the Babel-builders, xi.1–9;
(viii) the cowardice and insincerity of Abraham, xii.11–13;
(ix) the greed and selfishness of Lot, xiii.10,11,13;
(x) the insolence of Hagar, xvi.4;
(xi) the jealousy and severity of Sarah, xvi.5,6;
(xii) the untruthfulness of Sarah, xviii.15;
(xiii) the uncleanness of Sodom, xix.4,5;
(xiv) the unnatural proposal of Lot, xix.8;
(xv) the sin and punishment of Lot's wife, xix.26;
(xvi) the incestuous conduct of Lot and his daughters, xix.30–38;
(xvii) the cowardly insincerity of Abraham repeated, xx.11–13;
(xviii) the petulant behaviour of Ishmael, xxi.9;
(xix) the violence and harshness of Sarah, xxi.10;
(xx) the partiality of Isaac and Rebekah, xxv.28;

(xxi) the selfish over-reaching of Jacob, xxv.31,33;
(xxii) the reckless impatience of Esau, xxv.32;
(xxiii) the weakness of Isaac, like his father's, xxvi.7,
(xxiv) the gross deceitfulness of Rebekah, xxvii.1–17;
(xxv) the ready lying of Jacob, xxvii.19,20,24;
(xxvi) the deadly hatred of Esau, xxvii.41, xxxii.7,11;
(xxvii) the subtlety and fraud of Laban, xxix.23;
(xxviii) Jacob's unkind neglect of Leah, xxix.30,31–34, xxx.15;
(xxix) the passionate envy of Rachel, xxx.1,8;
(xxx) the dishonest duplicity of Jacob, xxx.37–43;
(xxxi) the covetous greed of Laban, xxxi.7,8,41,42;
(xxxii) the idolatrous conduct of Rachel, &c. xxxi.19, xxxv.2,4;
(xxxiii) the abject fear of Jacob, xxxii.7,11,20;
(xxxiv) the supple servility of Jacob, xxxiii.3,8,10;
(xxxv) the sly pretext of Jacob, xxxiii.13–15;
(xxxvi) the dishonour of Dinah, xxxiv.2,31;
(xxxvii) the treacherous guile of the sons of Jacob, xxxiv.15–17;
(xxxviii) the ruthless ferocity of Simeon and Levi, xxxiv.25,30, xlix.5–7;
(xxxix) the rapacity of the sons of Jacob, xxxiv.27–29;
(xl) the incest of Reuben, xxxv.22, xlix.4;
(xli) the talebearings of Joseph, xxxvii.2$^{b}$;
(xlii) Jacob's partial fondness for Joseph, xxxvii.3;
(xliii) the hatred felt towards Joseph by his brothers, xxxvii.4,8,11;
(xliv) the self-conceit of Joseph, xxxvii.10;
(xlv) the conspiracy of his brothers to kill him, xxxvii.20;
(xlvi) their ill-usage of him, and selling him, xxxvii.24,28;
(xlvii) their deceit practised on their father, xxxvii.31,32;
(xlviii) the wickedness of Er, Judah's first-born, xxxviii.8;
(xlix) the wickedness of Onan, xxxviii.9,10;
(l) the deceit practised on Tamar, xxxviii.14;
(li) Tamar's incest and Judah's incontinence, xxxviii.18;
(lii) the hypocritical severity of Judah, xxxviii.24;
(liii) the lewdness of Potiphar's wife, xxxix.7,10,12;
(liv) her false accusation of Joseph, xxxix.14,17,18;
(lv) Pharaoh's wrath with his officers, xl.2,3,22, xli.10,13;
(lvi) Joseph's harsh treatment of his brethren, xlii.9,12,14–17,19,24, xliv.17;
(lvii) Joseph's want of truthfulness, xlii.9,12,14,16;
(lviii) Joseph's putting a lie in the mouth of his steward, xliv.4,5,15;
(lix) Joseph's hard measures with the Egyptians, xlvii.15,16,20,21:
(lx) the dread of Joseph's brethren, lest he should take vengeance upon them after his father's death, l.15–18.

48. It is true, of course, that together with the darker features of the history there are mixed in X by way of contrast

'some also of brighter character. Thus we read of Noah's grateful sacrifice, viii.20, of Abraham's obedience, xii.4[a],xxii.1–10, of his habitual piety, xii.7,8,xiii.4,18, unselfishness, xiii.8,9, courage, xiv.13–16, generosity, xiv.22–24, faith, xv.6, hospitality, xviii.2–8, faithfulness, xviii.19,xxvi.5, humanity, xviii.23–32, fatherly concern, xxiv.3,4,6–8,—of Pharaoh's uprightness, xii.18–20, Abimelech's integrity and generosity, xx.4–6,14–16, xxvi.9,11, his just rebuke of Abraham, xx.9, and of Isaac, xxvi.10,—of Isaac's meekness, xxvi.20–22,—of Jacob's diligence, xxx.29,30,xxxi.38–40,—of Esau's generous conduct, xxxiii.9,12, 15,—of Reuben's kindliness, xxxvii.21,22,xlii.22,37,—of Judah's fraternal, xxxvii.26,27, and filial affection, xliii.8–10,xliv.18–34, —of Jacob's love for his children, xxxvii.34,35,xlii.36,38,xliii.14, xlv.26–28,xlvi.30,—of Joseph's fidelity, xxxix.2–6,8,21–23, chastity, xxxix.9,10,13, modesty, xl.8,xli.16, patience, xl.14,15, tenderness of heart, xlii.24,xliii.30,xlv.1–15,xlvi.29,l.1,19–21,— of Pharaoh's liberality, xlv.17–20,xlvii.5,6.

49. Yet still the more sombre traits greatly predominate in these portions of Genesis; and especially those stories of impurity, which make so many passages of Genesis totally unfit for public or family—if not for private—reading, are all due to the hand of the Jehovist. And, though we speak of Joseph's 'tenderness of heart' towards his father and brothers, yet it is hard to reconcile with this those parts of the story, which represent him as having lived for the seven fruitful years in possession of all the power of Egypt, yet never having sent during all that time a single messenger into Canaan, to comfort his father's heart with the tidings of his own existence, or to learn whether his father still lived, and how he and his brother Benjamin fared.

50. It is just as difficult to explain consistently the fact that when Joseph knew by his brothers' report that his father still lived, he, such a dutiful and loving son, allowed his old father to remain for twelve months longer in entire ignorance of his own

fate, and made no provision whatever to supply him and his family, and his brothers' families,—at least *seventy* souls, not reckoning his brothers' wives and servants, xlvi.26,27,—with food during all that time, amidst the straits of that terrible famine, except by sending them, free of expense, as much corn as the ten asses could carry, xlii.25. It is still more impossible to believe that such a tender-hearted son and brother could have left it to the mere chance of his brothers coming again in the following year, whether he should ever hear of his father and Benjamin again, or, when they did come again, could have made the attempt—by lying himself, and teaching his steward to lie—to steal Benjamin from his father, as he himself had been stolen, and to send his brothers back to Canaan to carry to the aged patriarch the heart-breaking tidings, that his darling son was seized by the governor of Egypt, and condemned to be treated as a slave for theft, xliv.17.

51. But, indeed, from the composite character of the whole Book of Genesis, it must necessarily follow that we obtain but a broken and distorted view of the life and character of any one of the patriarchs. This is a point of great interest, and, of course, is not at all considered by ordinary readers and expositors of the Bible. We often hear, for instance, the character of Abraham set forth, as a model of excellence for the imitation of all ages. But *what* Abraham? *Which* of the Abrahams, whose doings we find mixed up in such utter confusion, by the different writers concerned in the composition of the story in Genesis? How perplexing it is to find, in the account of the 'father of the faithful,' the record of conduct so mean and unworthy as that narrated in xii.11–20, and then to find, after an interval of some twenty years, the very same base act repeated by him,—at a time, too, when Sarah was (according to the narrative) 'old and well-stricken in age,' xviii.11,—in fact, a worn-out woman of ninety, xvii.17,—yet miraculously pregnant with Isaac, the child of promise, the centre of such great hopes, the reward of so many years of patient faith and expectation!

52. But all this confusion and contradiction is explained, when we consider that the story of Abraham, as we now read it in the Bible, is not a simple story by one single writer, but the composite work of two or three, or it may be, as we shall see, of even four or five minds, and combines the conceptions of various authors, writing each from his own point of view in very different ages. The original Elohistic story, in its grand simplicity, represents the patriarch, as we have said, without any flaw. He migrates of his own accord, without any previous call of Elohim, from Charran to Canaan, xii.4$^{b}$,5, carrying out merely the purpose of his father; he dwells in the land of Canaan, xiii.12$^{a}$, and there appears as the highly-honoured servant of Elohim, with whom El Shaddai speaks and makes a covenant, to give 'to him and to his seed after him' the land of Canaan, the land of his sojournings, appointing the rite of circumcision to be the sign and seal of that covenant, xvii. Abraham is reverent, *v.*3, and obedient, *v.*23-27; he receives the promised son, and circumcises him, xxi.2–5. His wife Sarah dies, and, with inimitable courtesy, he makes the purchase from the sons of Heth of the burying-place in the field of Machpelah; and then he dies, and is buried by his two sons,—

'in a good old age, an old man and full of years, and was gathered unto his people,' xxv.8.

53. And this is all the genuine original story of Abraham. This is the real Abraham of the Bible, the Abraham of the Elohist. We have here no mighty Sheikh, with his 'three hundred and eighteen' trained servants, all born in his house, going out to do battle with the King of Elam and his allies, xiv,—no expulsion of Ishmael, no purpose of sacrificing Isaac, no marrying another wife or wives, and begetting six sons, xxv.1–4, either during Sarah's lifetime, when Abraham was above a hundred years old, or after her death, when he was a hundred and thirty-seven years old, xxiii.1, though it seemed to himself incredible that a child should be born to him even at ninety-nine, xvii.17.

54. Abraham receives no promise for his seed of all the land,—

'from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates,' xv.18.

But then, on the other hand, his character is not lowered by having ascribed to him the miserable subterfuge in the case of Pharaoh, xii.11–13, or the still more reprehensible repetition of this fault in the case of Abimelech, xx.2,11–13. All the additions, which are made by later writers to the original story, are mere refractions and distortions of the character of Abraham, as viewed through their own atmospheres. And so, too, the Elohistic Isaac has not the discredit of the act attributed to him in xxvi.6–11. And there is no sign of rivalry or enmity having existed in the primitive story between Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau, nor, as far as can be judged from the fragments which remain, between Jacob and Laban, Leah and Rachel, or Joseph and his brethren.

55. Lastly, these later additions and interpolations not unfrequently introduce variations from the story as narrated by the Elohist, which amount to absolute discrepancy and contradiction. We have already exhibited at length those which exist in the two separate accounts of the Creation and the Deluge (IV.34,49), and we have noticed others fully in the course of the *Analysis*. We shall here merely sum up briefly these points of difference.

(i) In E (i.26), man is created *last* of all living creatures, *after* the birds and beasts, i.21,25:

in X (ii.7), man is created *first* of all living creatures, *before* the birds and beasts, ii.19.

(ii) In E (i.26), the man and woman are 'created' *together*:

in X (ii.7), the man is 'formed out of the dust' *without* the woman, who is made *last* of all creatures, out of his rib, and by a kind of afterthought, ii.18,21,22.

(iii) In E (i.28), the man and woman after their creation are 'blessed' *together* and endowed with dominion over the whole earth:

in X (ii.15), the man is first made, and placed alone in the garden, 'to till it and to keep it'; he alone receives the Divine Command not to eat of the 'tree of the knowledge of good and evil,' ii.16,17; and he has time to give names to all the birds and beasts before the woman is made, ii.20.

(iv) In E (v.3), Seth is evidently meant to be the first son of Adam, whose wife is never named by this writer:

in X (iv.1,2), Adam's wife, Eve, has had already two sons; and Cain, when there was no man living upon the earth but his father and himself, is afraid that, in the land of Nod, to which he is going, 'every one finding him shall slay him,' iv.14.

(v) In E (vi.19,20), Noah is commanded to take into the Ark only *one pair* of every kind of animal, and expressly of *birds*:

in X (vii.2), he is ordered to take *seven pairs* of clean animals, and expressly of *birds*.

(vi) In E (viii.13ª), on the *first* day of the *first* month, the waters of the flood were 'dried up from off the earth,' and nearly two months afterwards, 'on the *twenty-seventh* day of the *second* month, the earth was dried, viii.14, but Noah and his family with the beasts and the *birds*, viii.15, &c. were still in the Ark, viii.15,&c.:

in X (viii.13ᵇ), on the first of the above dates, Noah 'removed the covering of the Ark'; so that for nearly two months the Ark was opened, and the earth more or less dry, and yet the birds remained, though the *raven* and *dove* had flown away long ago, viii.7,12.

(vii) In E (viii.15–19), Noah and his family, with the beasts and the birds, had only to 'go-forth' out of the Ark:

in X (viii.4ᵃᵇ), the Ark had grounded, more than seven months previously, upon the top of Ararat, and, when the waters fell, it must have been left perched upon the summit; so that its inmates would have had to live for months amidst the regions of eternal snows, and then, if surviving, would have had to make a fearful descent into the plain.

(viii) In E (xii.4ᵇ,5), Abram migrates with Lot from Charran with the express intention of going to *Canaan*; and he does this *of his own accord*, continuing merely the movement which his father Terah had begun, xi.31:

in X (xii.1,4ª), Abram migrates at *Jehovah's express command*, to go to an *unknown* land, which Jehovah 'would show him,'—as it is said in Heb.xi.8, 'not knowing whither he went.'

(ix) In E (xvii.1–8), Abram receives the call of God and the promise of His blessing, and God makes with him a 'covenant,' to give 'to him and to his seed after him' the 'land of his sojournings,' the land of Canaan, *twenty-four* years after his settlement in Canaan, and thirteen after the birth of Ishmael, *comp.* xvi.16, xvii.1, without the slightest reference being made to any previous covenant or blessing:

in X (xii.2,3), Abram receives Jehovah's call and His blessing *before* he migrates from Charran to Canaan; and in xv.9–21 Jehovah makes with him a 'covenant,' *v.*18, *before* the birth of Ishmael, to give to his seed 'this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the River Euphrates.'

(x) In E (xxvi.34,35), Esau was 'forty years old' when he married his two Hittite wives, 'who were a bitterness of spirit unto Isaac and unto Rebekah'; and in consequence of this Jacob was sent away,—we must suppose without much delay,—to get for himself a wife in Padan-Aram, xxviii.1–5, upon which Esau also,

wishing to please his parents, takes, as a third wife, his first-cousin, the daughter of Ishmael, xxviii.6-9:

in X,* Jacob must have been about *seventy-seven* years old when he went to Charran, that is to say, Isaac and Rebekah must have endured this 'bitterness' *thirty-six years*, before they thought of sending Jacob to Padan-Aram; and at this mature age of *seventy-seven* Jacob deceives his father and injures his brother, xxvii.41–46, and still he keeps Rachel waiting seven years longer, xxix.20.

(xi) In E (xxxi.18), Jacob leaves Padan-Aram 'to go to Isaac his father in the land of Canaan'; and, according to E, he makes his way direct to his father at Hebron, xxxv.27:

in X, he lingers much upon the way; he builds himself a house and makes booths for his cattle at *Succoth*, xxxiii.18; he buys a piece of land at *Shechem*, xxxiii.19; and he receives God's command 'to go-up to Bethel and *dwell* there,' xxxv.1; *comp.* also xxxv.22, 'when Israel *dwelt* in that land,' and observe the fact, that Dinah, who was only about six years old when Jacob set-out from Padan-Aram on his return, xxx.21, must have been several years older, before she could have become the subject of such a narrative as that in xxxiv.

(xii) In E (xxxv.10), at *Bethel*, Jacob's name is changed to 'Israel,' *after* his return from Padan-Aram:

in X (xxxii.28), the Divine person, with whom he wrestled, had changed his name already to Israel *before* he crossed the Jordan.

(xiii) In E (xxxv.15), Jacob gives the name 'Bethel' to the 'place where God spake with him,' *after* his return to Canaan from Padan-Aram—'and Jacob set-up a pillar in the place where He spake with him, a pillar of stone; and he poured a drink-offering thereon, and he poured oil thereon,' *v.*14:

in X (xxviii.19), Jacob gives the name 'Bethel' to the place where Jehovah appeared to him twenty years previously, when he was on his way to Padan-Aram, 'and Jacob rose-up early in the morning, and took the stone that he had put for his pillows, and set it up for a pillar, and poured oil upon the top of it,' *v.*18; and, accordingly, the place is spoken of as 'Bethel' by *Elohim*, xxxv.1, as well as by Jacob himself, *v.*3, before it was so named, according to E, *v.*15.

(xiv) In E (xxxv.26), all the twelve sons of Jacob were 'born to him in *Padan-Aram*':

in X (xxxv.18), Benjamin was born in the *land of Canaan*; *comp.* also xxxii.22, xxxiii.2,7, where mention is made of Jacob's '*eleven* sons' and Rachel's *one* son, Joseph.

(xv) In E (xxxv.26, xxx.21), Jacob has *twelve* sons and *one* daughter, all born to him in Padan-Aram:

---

* Jacob was 130, xlvii.9, when he went down to Egypt, *nine* years after Pharaoh's dream, xlv.6, at which time Joseph was 30, xli.46; hence Joseph was 39 when Jacob was 130, and he was therefore born when Jacob was 91; but this was fourteen years after Jacob came to Laban, *comp.* xxxi.41 with xxx.25,26, &c.; so that Jacob was 77 when he went to Padan-Aram.

in X, the statements* connected with the births of the children make these births impossible, not including that of Benjamin.

(xvi) In E (xxxvi.6,7), Esau does not leave the land of Canaan till *after* Jacob's return, xxxv.27, and he then goes to Edom 'from the face of his brother Jacob,' because of the multitude of their cattle,—'for their gain was much, above dwelling together, and the land of their sojournings was not able to bear them because of their cattle':

in X (xxxii.3, xxxiii.16), Esau was already settled in the land of Edom, *before* Jacob's return from Padan-Aram.

(xvii) In E (xlvi.12[a]), *Er* and *Onan* are reckoned among the 'seventy' out of Jacob's loins, who went down with him into Egypt:

in X (xlvi.12[b]), the substitution of *Hezron* and *Hamul* for them, in connection with the interpolated story in xxxviii, introduces the impossibility, that Judah might have been a grandfather twice over at the age of thirty-nine, as I have shown in (I.19,20).

(xviii) In E (xxxvii.28[a],36), certain *Midianites* appear to have *kidnapped* Joseph, and sold him into Egypt;

in X (xxxvii.25–27,28[b]), his brothers sell him to a caravan of *Ishmaelites*, and they bring him down to Egypt, and sell him there, xxxix.1.

(xix) Lastly, there is, of course, the great discrepancy that in E the name 'Jehovah' is never used, (except in xvii.1, where obviously it has crept in by some accident—probably of transcription,) and is declared in E.vi.3 not to have been 'known' to the patriarchs; whereas in X 'Jehovah' is used a *hundred-and-sixty-three* times, and is put in the mouths of Abraham, xiv.22, Isaac, xxvi.22, and Jacob, xxviii.16,—of Sarah, xvi.2, Rebekah, xxvii.7, Leah, xxix.35, Rachel, xxx.24, —of Lamech, v.29, and Noah, ix.26,—of Laban, xxiv.31, and Bethuel, xxiv.50,51, —of Abraham's servant, xxiv.27,—of the heathen Abimelech, xxvi.28,29; nay, it was known to Eve, iv.1, and as early as the time of Enos, 'Then began men to call upon the Name of Jehovah,' iv.26.

---

* (i) Leah's *first four* sons (allowing two months between a birth and a conception) would require 3 years 6 months;

(ii) Bilhah's *first* might be born *immediately* after Leah's fourth, and her *second*, therefore, at the end of 4 years 5 months;

(iii) Zilpah's *first* might be born just after Bilhah's second, and her *second* at the end of 5 years 4 months;

(iv) Leah's *fifth* son might be born just after Zilpah's second, and her *seventh* child, Dinah, at the end of 7 years 2 months;

(v) Rachel's first son, Joseph, could not, therefore, have been born within the seven years, even on the above supposition.

# CHAPTER VI.

## THE SECOND JEHOVIST AND DEUTERONOMIST.

56. We have now seen that there is an essential and unmistakable difference between the contents of the Elohistic narrative and those of the remainder of Genesis, whether we look at the phraseology and forms of expression employed, or the general tone of thought which prevails in the one and the other of these two sets of passages, or observe the numerous and striking discrepancies and contradictions, which on close examination are found to exist between them. But one other fact now requires our attentive consideration, *viz.* that there exist some similar discrepancies between different portions of the non-Elohistic matter itself.

57. We may note the following instances of this phenomenon.

(i) In xii.14–20 we have the account of Abram's weakness and prevarication on Sarah's account at the Court of Pharaoh. It seems incredible that he should have repeated afterwards the very same conduct at the Court of Abimelech, xx.1–17.

(ii) In xiii.14–17 Jehovah promises to give to Abram the land of Canaan, which last agrees with the promise recorded by E in xvii.8.

Yet *between* these two passages, in xv.18, Jehovah makes a covenant with Abram to give to him the 'land, from the river of Egypt *unto the great river, the river Euphrates.*'

(iii) In xiv Abraham is represented as a warlike and spirited Sheikh, who gallantly pursued and routed the whole forces of the confederate kings, which had ravaged the land of Canaan under Chedorlaomer, and carried Lot captive.

Yet in xx he is represented as weak-spirited and pusillanimous, afraid of the people of Gerar because of his wife, and sheltering himself under a mean evasion.

(iv) In xiv, again, Abraham has a great body of 318 servants, trained in his own house, whom he leads out to war.

Yet in xxi.25,26, we find him remonstrating with Abimelech about a well which Abimelech's servants had 'taken away by force,' as if he had no such body of men at his command, as he plainly cannot be supposed to have had, when he feared that the people of Gerar would 'slay him for his wife's sake,' xx.11.

(v) In xvi.7 Hagar, when she fled of her own accord from Sarah, was found by the angel 'by a spring of water in the wilderness, by the spring on the way to Shur,' 'between Kadesh and Bered,' *v.*14; and the spring receives the name 'Lakhai-roi' from the divine consolation she received.

Yet in xxi.14, when expelled with her child by Abraham, who was then living 'between Kadesh and Shur,' xx.1,—evidently therefore in the neighbourhood of this notable spring,—she wanders about in the wilderness of Beersheba, ready to perish for want of water.

(vi) In xxi.14 Hagar is expelled, with her son Ishmael, and Abraham gives her only a bundle of bread and a skin of water.

Yet in xxv.6 we read 'unto the sons of the concubines which Abraham had, Abraham gave gifts, and sent them away from Isaac his son, while he yet lived, eastward unto the east country.' But Abraham's concubines, apparently, consisted of *Hagar* and *Keturah* only; and the sons of the concubines must, therefore, have included Hagar's son, Ishmael, with Keturah's six sons, named in xxv.2.

(vii) In xxi.22–32 Abimelech, the king of the Philistines, and Phichol the captain of his host, pay a visit to *Abraham*, and Abimelech makes a covenant upon oath with Abraham.

Yet in xxvi.26–31, apparently the very same king Abimelech, and Phichol the captain of his host, and Akhuzzath, one of his friends, pay a visit to *Isaac*, and make a covenant upon oath with him, a century afterwards.

(viii) In xxi.31, *Abraham* gives the name 'Beersheba' (=well of the oath) to the place where he and Abimelech *sware* to one another, and accordingly Abraham, we are told, 'dwelt at Beersheba,' xxii.19.

Yet in xxvi.33 *Isaac*, about a century afterwards, gives the name 'Sheba' to the well, which his servants dug on the day when he and Abimelech sware to one another, and it is added, '*therefore* the name of the city is Beersheba unto this day.'

(ix) In xxxvii.27,28b, Joseph's brethren *sell* him to the Ishmaelites.

Yet in xl.15 he says himself that he 'was *stolen*, or kidnapped, out of the land of the Hebrews.'

(x) In xxxix.20–23 Joseph is put in prison by his master for a (supposed) very grave offence, and there finds favour with the 'keeper of the prison,' and has all the prisoners given into his charge.

Yet in xl.4 Joseph is merely assigned by his master, 'the captain of the guard,' as a servant or slave to wait upon the two noblemen; and the chief butler speaks of him, in xli.12, not as a fellow-prisoner, but merely as an ordinary 'servant of the captain of the guard.'

(xi) In xli.34 Joseph advises that Pharaoh should take-up only 'the *fifth part* of the land of Egypt in the seven plenteous years.'

Yet in *v.*35 he speaks of his gathering '*all* the food of these good years that come.'

(xii) In xlv.17–20 Pharaoh sends expressly Jacob's eleven sons with wagons, to bring their father and their families, and come and live in Egypt—'Take your father and households, and come unto me, and I will give you the good of the land of Egypt, and ye shall eat of the fat of the land.'

Yet in xlvii.4 they speak to Pharaoh as if he had never invited them at all.

58. The above instances are sufficient to show that discrepancies exist between different portions of the non-Elohistic parts of Genesis,—although some of them would probably admit of a plausible explanation, if it were not evident, from a careful examination of the text, that they are real discrepancies, arising from a difference of authorship. For we have now to state, and as we hope to show plainly to the satisfaction of the reader, that the non-Elohistic matter of Genesis is by no means *homogeneous*, but consists of contributions by the hands of *three* (as we believe) or, as some hold, of *four* different writers. The evidence of this fact is fully given in the course of the *Analysis*. We can only here produce the salient points of it, for the information of the general reader.

THE SECOND JEHOVIST ($J_2$).

59. First, then, it would seem that xiv is a chapter *sui generis*, having no special relations with any other part of Genesis. It comes in abruptly, unconnected with the story before or after, except that, by the mention of Abram's living at Mamre, *v.*13, and of Lot's being carried captive, it has found its place suitably in the history after xiii.12$^b$,18. Still, it might be removed altogether without any loss to, or interruption of, the general narrative. It is, in short, a mere episode; and it brings Abram before us, as observed above, in the character of a powerful and warlike Sheikh, with 318 trained servants in his house, *v.*14, of which we find no trace whatever in the rest of the history. Rather, the subsequent account of his going to sojourn in Gerar, where Abimelech takes his wife from him, xx.2, and Abraham is afraid of his life, and practises a deceit to save it, *v.*11–13, shows plainly that, in the view of the writer of

this last Chapter, he had no such an immense body of trained servants, with which he had routed the combined forces of the eastern kings, and needed not therefore to have feared the power of the petty prince of Gerar,—much less have had reason to complain to him that his servants had taken by force the well which he had dug, xxi.25.

60. Accordingly, while HUPFELD, *p.*142, assigns this Chapter to the Jehovist, yet he notes, on *p.*118, that he 'may have probably derived it from an older source.' So KNOBEL observes, *Gen. p.*143,144—

> This section belongs to the Jehovistic supplementary insertions . . . Yet we have here no free narration of the Jehovist himself: The style is not sufficiently easy and flowery for this, and the chapter contains too many strange expressions . . The Jehovist must therefore have taken the passage from some older document.

DELITZSCH observes upon this Chapter, *p.*643, that, though marked as Jehovistic,—

> it varies much from the character of the other Jehovistic passages, and seems to have been taken by the Jehovist from some separate document.

So ASTRUC, EICHHORN, EWALD, HITZIG, TUCH, all regard this section as standing alone, distinct from all the other matter in Genesis.

61. In the *Analysis* (66-76) I have fully discussed the contents of this Chapter; and I have there shown that, while it has a few points of contact with each of the other writers in Genesis, yet as a whole it is distinct altogether in style and tone from all of them. It contains *four* times, *v.*18,19,20,22, the expression אֵל עֶלְיוֹן, *El Helyon*, 'El Most High,' a designation of the Divine Being, which occurs nowhere else in the Pentateuch, and only *thrice* besides in the Bible, Ps.lvii.2(3), lxxviii.35,56. And the very fact, that it *is* used in these Psalms, shows that it is not employed in the passage before us merely as a *foreign* expression, such as might be thought suitable in the mouth of the Canaanite king, Melchizedek; it was used, it seems, by pious Israelites, and accordingly it is put

here, as well as 'Jehovah,' into the mouth of Abram, *v.*22. So in *v.*19,22 we have another peculiar designation of the Supreme Being, 'Proprietor of Heaven and Earth,' which is found nowhere else in the Bible.

62. Since 'Jehovah' is used in this chapter, *v.*22, we may regard it as *Jehovistic*, and refer to the writer as the *Second Jehovist* ($J_2$). But it does not follow that every portion of the Chapter must be from his hand. We find here many ancient names of places, to which are often added their later equivalents, *e.g.* *v.*2,8, 'Bela, *that is Zoar*,' *v.*3, 'the vale of Siddim, *that is the Salt Sea*,' *v.*7, 'En-Mishpat, *that is Kadesh*,' *v.*17, 'the valley of Shaveh, *that is the King's dale*.' And the fact, that the first of these explanations is repeated *twice* seems, to confirm the suspicion which at once arises that these notes are all inserted by a later hand, at a time when the old names were beginning to be almost forgotten. I have shown (*Anal.* 75) that many of these ancient names are mentioned by the *Deuteronomist*, who has also, in D.ii.10–12,20–23,iii.9,11, given some indications of a taste for antiquarian research. It seems not unreasonable to conjecture that these notes may be from his hand,—more especially when we observe, (as will now be shown), that there are other Deuteronomistic insertions in the Book of Genesis.

THE LATER EDITOR OR DEUTERONOMIST (D).

63. We have seen that a large portion of the Book of Joshua consists, beyond all doubt, of Deuteronomistic matter, which bears every appearance of having been inserted by the Deuteronomist himself, when editing the older document which had come into his hands. In fact, as we have said already (III.566), it would seem most strange that one, who had conceived the grand idea of adding the whole Book of Deuteronomy to the existing Tetrateuch, should not also have revised and retouched the older matter. Accordingly, we believe that we have found

distinct traces of his hand, not only in Joshua, but in each of the First Four Books of the Pentateuch, and, in particular, in Genesis, to which we confine attention in this volume.

64. In short, we are strongly confirmed in the conviction, already intimated in (III.566), that the Deuteronomist, living in the early days of *Josiah* was—not the *Compiler*, but—the *Editor* of the Pentateuch and Book of Joshua, which he interpolated throughout, and enlarged especially with the addition of the Book of Deuteronomy. BOEHMER also maintains, as the result of his own recent and most laborious researches, that the Editor of the Pentateuch—whom however he regards as having *compiled* that work from three original independent documents —lived in the age of *Josiah*, and he adds, 'no traces of a later age can be detected.' But he does not identify his Compiler with the writer of Deuteronomy, whom he assigns to a somewhat earlier date, the time of *Manasseh*; and he says, *p.*123—

The Deuteronomist himself cannot have been the Compiler: for the character of Deuteronomy, which has not without reason been styled as in a certain sense evangelical, is quite distinct from the spirit of the Compiler, which (as we shall see) is on the whole altogether dry and unrefreshing.

65. But this last remark of BOEHMER is only applicable to some of the passages, which he himself assigns to the Later Compiler or Editor, but which we certainly do *not* ascribe to him. On the contrary, those passages, in all the first four Books of the Pentateuch, which upon a careful examination of the style and context we feel compelled to assign to the Later Editor, are the most spirited and 'refreshing' passages in the whole narrative, and quite in the style of Deuteronomy itself. They are passages, in short, which for the most part seem to have been inserted for the very purpose of quickening the history with a deeper spiritual meaning, and stirring more effectually the reader's heart with words of religious life and earnestness. BOEHMER, however, has started with the fundamental error of ascribing G.iv to the Compiler; and that has (in our judgment) seriously misled him in some of his subsequent conclusions.

66. In the *Analysis* we have given fully the reasons, which have led us to assign the following sections to the *Later Editor* of Josiah's reign, and to identify him with the Deuteronomist—

vi.4, x.8–12, xv.1–21, xviii.18,19, xxii.14–18, xxiv.59,60, xxvi.4,5, xxxv.8.

We thus ascribe 39 verses of Genesis to this writer, some of which HUPFELD also gives to his *Compiler, viz.*—

vi.4, x.8–12, xv.13–16,—

while BOEHMER assigns to him—

vi.4, x.8[a], xv.12–17[a], xxii.15–18, xxvi.4,5, xxxv.8,—

though he also gives to him many other passages in Genesis, without (as it seems to us) any sufficient reason for so doing.

We must refer to the *Analysis* for the grounds of our own judgment in opposition to the views of HUPFELD and BOEHMER. But the reader may be reminded that this difference of opinion affects only the minor question of the separation of the non-Elohistic portions of Genesis into their component portions. Upon the main point, as to the passages which belong to the Elohist, and constitute the *oldest* parts of the narrative, the groundwork of all the rest, there is, as we have seen, substantial and very complete agreement, between our own view and those set forth by HUPFELD and BOEHMER.

67. We cannot here reproduce at full length the evidence of the *Analysis*, which leads us to ascribe to the Deuteronomist the above passages. But the following series of phenomena, selected from that evidence, will enable the reader to see at once that we have some ground at least for this conclusion.

(i) xv.2,8, 'Adonai-Jehovah,' as in D.iii.24, ix.26,—*nowhere else in the Pentateuch.*

(ii) xv.3,4,4, יָרַשׁ, *yarash*, 'inherit,' with accus. of *person* inherited, as in D.ii.12, 21,22, ix.1, xi.23, xii.2,29,29, xviii.14, xix.1, xxxi.3, and N.xxi.32,—*nowhere else in the Pentateuch.*

(iii) xv.5, 'look now toward *heaven* and the *stars*, if thou art able to count them—so shall thy seed be';

xxii.17, 'I will surely multiply thy seed as the *stars of heaven*';

xxvi.4, 'I will multiply thy seed as the *stars of heaven*';

*comp.* 'Jehovah hath multiplied you, and behold! ye are this day as the *stars of heaven* for multitude,' D.i.10;

'Jehovah hath placed thee as the *stars of heaven* for multitude,' D.x.22;

'Ye were as the *stars of heaven* for multitude,' D.xxviii.62.

N.B. J compares Israel with the 'dust of the earth,' xiii.16, xxviii.14, 'the sand of the sea,' xxxii.12, the 'fishes of the sea,' xlviii.16; but the comparison with the 'stars of heaven' occurs *nowhere else in the Pentateuch*, except in the above passages, and in E.xxxii.13, which may also belong to D.

(iv) xv.6, 'and He reckoned it to him as righteousness';

*comp.* 'and it shall be to us as righteousness,' D.vi.25;

'and it shall be to thee as righteousness,' D.xxiv.13.

(v) xv.7, 'I am Jehovah, which brought thee out &c.,' as in D.i.27, iv.20,37, v.15, vi.12,21,23, vii.8,19, viii.14, ix.12,26,28,28,29, xiii.5,10, xvi.1, xxvi.8, xxix.25—*nowhere else in Genesis*, from which fact we may infer that, though the phrase was evidently a favourite one with the Deuteronomist, it was *not* common with the Jehovist or any other of the principal writers of Genesis.

(vi) xv.7, 'give to thee the land to inherit it,' as in D.iii.18, v.31, xix.2,14, xxi.1.

N.B. *Similar*, but *not identical*, expressions occur only in G.xxviii.4, L.xx.24, N.xxxiii.53.

(vii) xv.18, 'unto the great river, the river Euphrates,' as in D.i.7, Jo.i.4(D), *comp.* 'from the river, the river Euphrates,' D.xi.24.

(viii) xviii.18, 'he shall *become* a *nation great and mighty*';

*comp.* 'he *became* there a *nation great, mighty*, and numerous,' D.xxvi.5.

(ix) xviii.18, 'a nation great and mighty,' as in D.iv.38,vii.1,ix.1,14,xi.23,xxvi.5, also N.xiv.12, Jo.xxiii.9(D)—*nowhere else in the Bible.*

(x) xviii.18, xxii.18, xxvi.4, 'all nations of the earth,' as in D.xxviii.1, Jer.xxvi.6, xxxiii.9, xliv.8, Zech.xii.3,—*nowhere else in the Bible.*

N.B. The *Jehovistic* phrase is 'all families of the ground,' xii.3, xxviii.14.

(xi) xviii.19, 'he shall command his children, and they shall observe to do &c.';

*comp.* 'ye shall command your children to observe to do, &c.,' D.xxxii.46.

(xii) xviii.19, 'observe to do,' as in D.v.1,29, vi.3,25, vii.11, viii.1, xi.22,32, xii.1,32, xv.5, xvii.10,19, xix.9, xxiv.8, xxviii.1,15,58, xxxi.12, xxxii.46,—*nowhere else in the Pentateuch*;

*comp.* also 'observe' and 'do' in the same context, D.iv.6, vi.17 (*see v.18*), vii.12, xiii.18, xvi.12, xxiii.23, xxxi.8, xxvi.16, xxviii.13, xxix.9,—also L.xviii.4,5,26,30, xix.37, xx.8,22, xxii.31, xxv.18, xxvi.3,—but *nowhere else in the Pentateuch.*

N.B. There is evidently some close connection between L.xviii–xxvi and Deuteronomy, of which there are many other signs.

(xiii) xviii.19, 'righteousness and judgment,' a later prophetical formula, found in Jer.iv.2, ix.24, xxii.3,15, xxiii.5, xxxiii.15, *comp.* li.9, Ez.xviii.5,19,21,27, xxxiii. 14,19, xlv.9, 1K.x.9, 1Ch.xviii.14, 2Ch.ix.8,—but *nowhere else in the Bible*; *comp.* however, D.xxxiii.21, 'he *did* the *righteousness* of Jehovah and His *judgments* with Israel.'

(xiv) xxii.16, 'saith Jehovah,' as in N.xiv.28, the only instances in the Pentateuch of the use of this later prophetical formula.

(xv) xxii.16, יַעַן אֲשֶׁר, *yahan ăsher*, 'because that,' as in D.i.36, Jo.xiv.14(D), —*nowhere else in the Pentateuch.*

(xvi) xxii.17, 'I will surely multiply thy seed as the *stars of heaven*,' see (iii).

(xvii) xxii.17, 'as the sand which is on the lip of the sea,' as in Jo.xi.4(D).

N.B. J says 'as the sand of the sea,' xxxii.12.

(xviii) xxii.17,xxiv.60, 'thy seed shall inherit the gate of his enemies,'—*nowhere else in the Bible.*

(xix) xxii.18, 'all nations of the earth,' see (x).

(xx) xxii.18,xxvi.5, עֵקֶב אֲשֶׁר, *hekev ăsher*, 'because that,'—*nowhere else in the Bible*, except 2S.xii.6; but *comp.* עֵקֶב in D.vii.12, viii.20, N.xiv.24.

(xxi) xxiv.60, 'thy seed shall inherit the gate of his enemies,' see (xviii).

(xxii) xxvi.4,5, so entirely corresponds to xxii.17,18, that, if one of these passages is due to D, so also must be the other.

(xxiii) xxvi.4, 'as the stars of heaven,' see (iii).

(xxiv) xxvi.4, 'all nations of the earth,' see (x).

(xxv) xxvi.5, עֵקֶב אֲשֶׁר, 'because that,' see (xx).

(xxvi) xxvi.5, 'he hearkened unto my voice and observed my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws';

*comp.* 'thou shalt hearken unto the voice of Jehovah thy God, to observe all his commandments,' D.xiii.18;

'if thou hearken unto the voice of Jehovah thy God, to observe to do all these commandments,' D.xv.5, xxviii.1;

'to observe His statutes and His commandments and His judgments, and to hearken unto His voice,' D.xxvi.17;

'if thou hearken not unto the voice of Jehovah thy God, to observe to do all His commandments and His statutes,' D.xxviii.15;

'because thou hearkenedst not unto the voice of Jehovah thy God, to observe His commandments and His statutes,' D.xxviii.45;

'if thou shalt hearken unto the voice of Jehovah thy God, to observe His commandments and His statutes,' D.xxx.10.

(xxvii) xxvi.5, '*keep My charge and My commandments and My statutes and My laws*';

*comp.* '*keep His charge and His statutes* and His judgments *and His commandments*,' D.xi.1.

(xxviii) xxvi.5, 'charge, commandments, statutes, laws';

*comp.* the heaping together of *four* such expressions in D.xi.1, and of *three* in D.iv.45, v.31, vi.1,17,20, vii.11, viii.11, xxvi.17, xxx.16,—also L.xxvi.15,46, but *nowhere else in the Pentateuch.*

68. We ascribe, then, to the Deuteronomistic Editor, as we have said, these 39 verses of Genesis, together with the explanatory notes in xiv.2,3,7,8,17, and similar insertions in xxiii.2,19,

xxxv.6,19, xxxvi.43, xlviii.7,—the *older* names having probably become somewhat obsolete in his later time, and seeming to need such explanations. Including the 24 verses of xiv, but not reckoning the above fragmentary notes, we shall thus have 63 verses to be separated from the non-Elohistic matter of Genesis for the *Second Jehovist* and *Deuteronomist*, leaving 1134 verses (22) which have still to be considered.

69. Here, however, we shall now come upon a question, on which, it must be confessed, our views differ materially from those of HUPFELD and BOEHMER. Yet again let the reader be reminded, this difference of opinion exists only about a question of *secondary* importance. Since we are substantially agreed as to the contents of the Elohistic document, it matters little comparatively whether we regard the Jehovist as an *independent*, or a *supplementary*, writer,—whether we assign to him more or less of these remaining 1134 verses,—whether we regard him as *identical* or *not* with the writer, whom we are now about to speak of as the *Second Elohist*.

# CHAPTER VII.

## THE SECOND ELOHIST AND JEHOVIST.

SECOND ELOHIST ($E_2$).

70. The portions which will remain of Genesis, when the parts due to $J_2$ and D shall have been removed, amounting (68) to 1134 verses,—*i.e.* to about *three-fourths* of the whole Book,—are so homogeneous in character that we are unable to distinguish any marked difference in style and tone between different sections of them, except in one respect.

A glance at xx.1–17 will show that in this section the name 'Elohim' is used *exclusively* (*six* times), *viz.* in *v.*3,6, 11,13,17,17; and the same phenomenon occurs again in xxi.6–22, where we have 'Elohim' *nine* times, *v.*6,12,17,17, 17,19,20,22, and no 'Jehovah.'

71. It is impossible, however, to assign these passages to the original Elohist, because they exhibit no trace of his style (except the use of the Divine Name), and contain also a number of decidedly Jehovistic formulæ. In fact, on reference to the Table in (30), it will be seen that most of the *twenty-six* formulæ there enumerated find their representatives in these two short sections. Yet the writer has clearly abstained deliberately, for some reason or other, from the use of the name 'Jehovah,' and must be regarded, therefore, as *an* Elohistic writer, distinct, however, from the primitive Elohist. We may call him henceforth the *Second Elohist*. But it becomes now a very difficult matter to separate the parts due to this author from those of the

author, whom we have long known as the 'Jehovist,' and to whom the remainder of Genesis belongs. And this difficulty arises from two distinct causes.

72. First, as we have said, the style of the two writers is so very similar, except in the use of the Divine Name, that it is impossible to distinguish them by considerations of style alone, as we can, in most cases, very readily distinguish the style of the Elohist from that of the Jehovist, and from that of the Deuteronomist.

In fact, in those passages, which we assign to $E_2$, there is not a single favourite formula, which is not also used by J. It is true, the latter writer has many formulæ which are not used by $E_2$. But this may be explained—at least to some extent—by the simple fact, that the quantity of matter, which we give to $E_2$, is very much less than that which we assign to J; since this, of course, would allow more room for the Jehovist to employ a variety of formulæ, which the other writer might be found to have also used, if he had written as copiously. It may be said, indeed, that the style of the Jehovist does seem to be somewhat *freer* and *easier* than that of the Second Elohist,—that it appears to show a greater command of words, and a greater readiness in the use of the pen. But whether this may be due to an original difference of mental constitution, or merely to advanced age and experience, and long-continued exercise in writing, is a question which would still remain to be considered.

73. But, secondly, while the difference in style (if any) between these two writers is certainly so slight, as to afford a very poor criterion for separating their different compositions, this difficulty is increased by the fact that the Jehovist not unfrequently uses the name 'Elohim,' and sometimes even *exclusively*. Thus HUPFELD, who seems to maintain very strenuously that J never uses 'Elohim' except for some *special* reason,—as where he says 'Elohim shall enlarge Japheth,' ix.27, because 'Jehovah' was more properly 'the Elohim of Shem,'

*v.*26,—yet allows that, in the passage produced above, xxi.6-22, *v.*6, in which 'Elohim' occurs, is due, not to $E_2$, (to whom all the other instances in this section of the use of this name belong,) but to J, *viz.*—

'And Sarah said, Laughter hath Elóhim made to me; every one hearing will laugh with me,'—

observing, *p.*44, that such a phenomenon is not uncommon in the Jehovistic *etymologies*, *e.g.* iv.25, xli.51,52. But so, too, in xxxiii.5-11, which HUPFELD allows to be Jehovistic, we have 'Elohim' used *thrice*, *v.*5,10,11, and no 'Jehovah' occurs in the whole Chapter; and in xxii.1-13,—of which he says, *p.*178,—

'we certainly *should not think of the Second Elohist* for it, except for the use of the name 'Elohim,'—

and which the result of our own analysis compels us to assign, without doubt, to the Jehovist,—we have both 'Elohim,' *v.*8,12, and Elohim with the article, *v.*1,3,9, and only once 'Jehovah,' in the expression 'angel of Jehovah,' *v.*11.

74. Thus, on both these accounts, it becomes very difficult to separate with perfect confidence the parts due to these two writers. Nevertheless, in the *Analysis* we have done our best to effect this separation, and trust that to some extent we have succeeded, though our results differ here, as we have said, materially from those both of HUPFELD and BOEHMER. There is no indication that any other writer than those now named has been concerned in the composition of the Book of Genesis. The *Elohist*, the *Second Elohist*, the *Jehovist*, the *Second Jehovist*, and the *Later Editor* (or Compiler), are the *five* writers to whom, according to both HUPFIELD and BOEHMER, the whole of the present Book is due. But it seems to us most probable that these *five* should be reduced to *four*,—the *Second Elohist* being the same as the *Jehovist*, only writing at an earlier period of his life, before he had acquired that freedom and fluency, which seems to characterise the more decidedly Jehovistic matter.

75. It may be now asked, however, By *what*—if not by the

style or by the use of the Divine Name—can a difference of authorship be detected in these verses of Genesis, which remain when the matter due to E, $J_2$, and D, has been removed? The answer is, By carefully following the course of the narrative, observing such discrepancies as those exhibited above in (57), and noting where there are plain indications of a *junction* or *suture*,—the threads of two different statements being interlaced, as it were, with each other, in order to the insertion of a new addition to the original story. If we can disentangle these threads, so that the passage of J drops away, leaving the story as told by E, with the additions from the hand of $E_2$, still complete and intelligible, we shall have done something to show that our view is not altogether unfounded, and something also towards deciding the question, whether $E_2$ and J wrote as *independent* or as *supplementary* writers.

76. HUPFELD and BOEHMER both assume the former. They suppose that there were at least *three* independent documents, those of E, $E_2$, and J,—if there was not also a separate complete narrative of $J_2$, from which xiv has been extracted. These three documents, as they believe, were combined into one by a Later Compiler—living, says BOEHMER, in the age of Josiah,—and thus we have our present Book of Genesis.

HUPFELD very justly observes that the first trace of $E_2$ is met with in xx.1–17. But he has a difficulty with *v.*1: how could the words, 'And Abraham journeyed from *thence* &c.', have been the beginning of an original independent narrative? Accordingly, *p.*209, he ascribes this verse to J; yet elsewhere he says, *p.*173–175, *this* verse 'with its data of place'—

> cannot with perfect certainty be denied to $E_2$, since it supplies the indispensable notice of the locality for the narrative which follows.

BOEHMER feels the same difficulty, and tries to mend the matter by ascribing—as it seems to us, most unfortunately—xiv,xv, to $E_2$, arguing, *p.*110,111, that—

> In the *commencement* of a proper work, which should set-forth the history of

the descendants of Abraham, and specially of the children of Israel, the manner in which this writer, after a general notice [xiv.1] about the historical situation of that epoch, introduces Abram, not incidentally, but with a formal preparation, is quite appropriate.

But then he is obliged to assign the first words of xiv.1, 'and it came to pass,' to the Later Compiler, *p.*197 :—

It is not probable that this independent narrative should have begun with 'and it came to pass'; and there is no ground for supposing that anything has been cancelled before it.

77. In the *Analysis* we have considered fully all BOEHMER'S arguments in defence of his theory, and we believe that we have disproved them. We adhere entirely to HUPFELD'S statement, that the first trace of $E_2$ is found in xx.1–17. But we cannot doubt that *v.*1 belongs to this author; and we believe that he wrote the passage merely to *supplement* the original story of E,—perhaps referring, by the expression 'from thence,' either to the place in the 'land of Canaan,' where Abram 'dwelt,' according to the last-preceding notice of the Elohist in xiii.12$^a$, from which he went to sojourn in Gerar, xx.1, or, perhaps, using the expression loosely, without reference to any particular place, merely for the purpose of introducing his episode in xx.1–17. And we believe that all the other passages due to $E_2$, which are summed up below, are of the same *supplementary* character.

78. The following are the passages which we assign to $E_2$:—

xx.1–17
xxi.8–20,22–27$^a$,32
xxvi.18
xl.2,3$^a$,4,5$^a$,6–23
xli.1–30,32–34,36–39, 44,45,47,56,57
xlii.5,6$^a$,7$^a$
xlv.16–18,21$^a$

Thus we give to the *Second Elohist* 106 verses of Genesis, and there remain 1028, which belong to the *Jehovist.* Both HUPFELD and BOEHMER ascribe much more to $E_2$; and the latter endeavours to reproduce the complete independent narrative due to this writer. I have stated in the *Analysis* the reasons why I cannot agree with his conclusions. In fact, the

attempt to reconstruct a complete consistent story for each of $E_2$ and J has led him (as it seems to me) into hopeless difficulties. His object can only be effected by not unfrequently breaking up a single verse, in a very arbitrary manner, into *two*, or *three*, or even *four*, fragments, due respectively to his four writers A,B,C,D, (corresponding generally to our E, $E_2$, J, and D); and, when it is effected, the separate narratives of B and C are so artificially constructed, that it is impossible to receive them as representing the contents of the original documents.

79. HUPFELD, again, though he points out many passages due respectively to $E_2$ and J, and indicates gradually the ends which he supposes these writers had in view in writing their different stories, does not in all cases attempt to effect completely the separation of the two accounts; but contents himself with saying *e.g.* that 'in xxxi the two accounts are mingled, as they are also in the history of Joseph, xxxvii,xxxix—l,'—upon which last important section he writes as follows, *p.*192:—

> The same relation shows itself in the last section of Genesis, (the history of Joseph and of Joseph's family in Egypt,) between the Second Elohist and the parallel passages which have been assigned to the Jehovist, and would to all appearance show itself in the yet unresolved body of this section, if the separation of its parts were completed. Into this enquiry, however, I cannot undertake to enter in this already too-extended Treatise.

80. Here, then, we are left without the help of this distinguished author—and at a time, too, when we greatly needed his aid. For this last section of Genesis—the history of Joseph, &c., —is remarkable for containing *only* the name 'Elohim,'—except that we have 'Jehovah' *eight* times in xxxix, *viz.* *v.*2,3,3,5,5,21, 23,23, and *once* in xlix.18. In the rest of this section we have 'Elohim' or 'El' exclusively, *thirty-seven* times, *viz.*—

> xl.8, xli.16,25,28,32,32,38,39,51,52, xlii.18,28, xliii.14,23,23,29, xliv.16, xlv.5,7, 8,9, xlvi.1,2,3,3, xlviii.9,11,15,15,20,21, xlix.25, l.17,19,20,24,25.

Of the above, however, eight are included in passages which we ascribe (78) to $E_2$. There remain twenty-nine other instances. Is it possible to assign all these to J?

81. Some of these instances, indeed, are or would be allowed to J by HUPFELD himself, *e.g.* the etymologies, xli.51,52, the expression in xlix.25, (which he does assign to J), and the proverb, l.19; and thus the number is reduced to twenty-five. Of these again, several find parallels in undoubtedly Jehovistic passages, *e.g.*:—

xlii.18, 'I fear ELOHIM,' *comp.* 'thou fearest Elohim,' xxii.12;

xlii.28, 'what is this Elohim hath (made=) done to us?' *comp.* xxi.6, 'Laughter hath Elohim (done=) made to me?'

xliii.29, 'Elohim grant to thee,' *comp.* 'Elohim hath granted to me,' xxxiii.11;

xliii.23, 'your Elohim,' *comp.* 'thy Elohim,' xxvii.20;

xliii.23, 'the Elohim of your father,' xlvi.1,3, 'the Elohim of his father,' xlvi.3, l.17, 'the Elohim of thy father,' *comp.* 'the Elohim of thy father,' xxvi.24.

xlviii.9, 'the children which Elohim hath given to me,' *comp.* 'the children which Elohim hath granted to thy servant,' xxxiii.5.

Deducting these, there remain only fifteen instances, in these ten chapters, most of which may be compared with those in xxvii.28, xxxiii.5,10,11, xxxix.9, which are all allowed by HUPFELD himself to belong to J.

82. There is nothing, then, improbable in the idea of the Jehovist having written the greater part of the history of Joseph,—and certainly not, if we regard the passages xxii.1–13, xxviii.10–22, as due to this author, which our analysis compels us to do. But here we separate distinctly from HUPFELD; for the view which we take of xxviii.10–22 will materially affect our view of some later passages. If this section be due to the Jehovist, as we believe, it must bring with it also xxxi, and xxxv.1–7, where references are so frequent to the 'El of Beth-El,' who is also referred to in xxxii.1,2, which HUPFELD himself is inclined to assign to the Jehovist. And the results of our analysis appear to confirm this conjecture. The phraseology employed throughout the history of Joseph is quite Jehovistic: and, though, it is true, two distinct stories may be traced in it, yet in the *style* of these stories there is no essential difference that we have been able to detect; in both, the same phrases are employed, as they are by the Jehovist in passages undoubtedly his; in both, the

name 'Elohim' is used exclusively, when the Divine Name is used at all.

83. In fact, even on HUPFELD'S showing, something like the above conclusion must follow. He admits that these last eleven Chapters of Genesis are made up almost entirely of matter due to $E_2$ and J, though he does not attempt to separate the parts due to these authors. But, if he had effected this separation, it must have appeared that J had not used here 'Jehovah' at all, except *once* in xlix.18, but, on the contrary, had used exclusively 'Elohim,'—unless, indeed, the separation could have been effected by him in such a way as to leave to J only portions, in which no name of the Deity occurs at all. And this I believe to be impossible.

84. But now, looking at these facts, and seeing how freely, in other parts of his narrative, the Jehovist uses the name 'Jehovah,'—*e.g. ten* times in iv, *eight* times in xvi, *ten* times in xviii, *seven* times in xix, *nineteen* times in xxiv, and even *eight* times in xxxix, *in the history of Joseph itself*,—it seems impossible to suppose that this writer should have composed, at *one and the same time*, these thoroughly Jehovistic passages, and also the part due to him in the history of Joseph, or the section xxii.1–13, where 'Elohim' occurs repeatedly, and 'Jehovah' scarcely at all. But may he not have written at *different* times? May it not be possible that the *Second Elohist* is the same as the *Jehovist*, and therefore uses similar formulæ and a similar style throughout, only increasing in ease and fluency, as he became more advanced in life and experience, and more used to the work? In his earliest attempts, when he first began to supplement the Elohistic narrative, by inserting the passages ascribed to $E_2$, his hand was, perhaps, somewhat stiff, and his style less free and flowing; and he has used here only 'Elohim,' as the Elohist had done before him. In his *latest* additions, he has used freely, and almost exclusively, 'Jehovah.' But these may

have been made after a considerable interval; the work may have been for some years in his hands; and thus he may have added to it at different times, employing 'Elohim' more freely in his earlier insertions than he did in his last.

85. This, in short, is the conviction which has been more and more pressed upon me, as I have proceeded with this enquiry, *viz.* that all the difficulties of the case—the perplexing phenomena, which have led to so much difference of opinion between HUPFELD and BOEHMER, as to the portions which should be assigned to $E_2$ and J respectively,—may all be explained on the supposition that these 1134 verses really belong to one and the same writer, who has retouched the original story at different times.

86. We shall return to this subject hereafter in giving our translations of the different parts of Genesis, when we shall endeavour to set before the reader as plainly as we can, the way in which we suppose that the Book of Genesis has been gradually formed. For the present, we sum up the results of our analysis, as follows.

(i) We have the narrative of the *Elohist*, the earliest portion of the whole Pentateuchal story, very fairly represented in its primitive form.

(ii) The above Elohistic matter, as a whole, is essentially distinct in tone and style from all the rest of Genesis.

(iii) G.xiv appears to be peculiar, having no decided resemblance to any other part of Genesis, and is probably due to an independent author, whom we have called the *Second Jehovist.*

(iv) G.xv and some other less important passages are interpolations by a Later Editor, whom we believe to be the *Deuteronomist.*

(v) Certain portions of the remainder of Genesis, amounting to 106 verses, may be regarded as the oldest additions which have been made to the original story; and these agree with the Elohistic matter in making no use whatever of the name 'Jehovah,' but in all other respects of style and tone they differ essentially from these, and must be ascribed to a *Second Elohist.*

(vi) In the rest of Genesis, about *three-fourths* of the whole, we can distinguish no *essential* differences in style and tone from those of those Second Elohist, except that in some sections 'Elohim' is used exclusively and in others less freely. But in by far the larger part of it 'Jehovah' is used almost exclusively; and in these last passages the writer certainly seems to show a more free and practised hand. Still we assign all these to the *Jehovist*; for we can trace no *essential* distinction, in tone or style, between the most Elohistic, and the most Jehovistic, portions of this matter.

(vii) It seems to us very probable that the Jehovist may be identical with the Second Elohist, and the difference observed in the use of the Divine Name may be only due to some change of *plan*, or to some change of *circumstances*, in the writer himself.

(viii) At all events we find that every favourite formula used by the Second Elohist is used also by the Jehovist; and the stories of sexual matters, which form so conspicuous a feature in the Jehovist's narrative, find their counterpart also in xx.1–17.

87. We must add also that the evidence before us seems to compel us to the conclusion that not only the Deuteronomist or Later Editor, but the Jehovist also, and the Second Elohist (if different from the Jehovist), were *not* independent original writers, but wrote merely to supplement the primary Elohistic story. It has seemed to us, indeed, from the first to be far more natural and probable that this should have been the case, than to suppose that *three* different writers should have taken in hand to write independently of each other, in those early days, *three different narratives* about the very same persons and the very same series of events. Of course, such an occurrence is conceivable; but it would seem to require very strong and distinct proof, before it could be admitted as the real explanation of the phenomena which are observed in the contents of Genesis, being in itself (in our judgment) highly improbable—at all

events, much less probable than the other view, which we find ourselves, upon a thorough examination of the evidence, at present compelled to adopt.

88. It is with much reluctance, and only after long consideration, that I express a difference on this point from so great an authority as Prof. HUPFELD. But I cannot resist the force of the evidence as it has presented itself to my own mind; and I shall now await the judgment of others.

If Prof. HUPFELD had separated the history of Joseph, and done it with success, his position would have been greatly strengthened. But he has not done this, and I find it impossible to ascribe the greater portion of this story to any other than the Jehovistic writer. Yet, if this be correct, since he here uses always the name 'Elohim,' he must, it would seem, have written it at a different part of his life from the time, when he penned the strongly Jehovistic chapters xviii,xix,xxiv,xxxix.

89. But, if this holds good, it seems to me that the rest of our conjecture must also be regarded as not altogether improbable. And it may be added that, on the supposition of the *supplementary* character of all the additions to the original story, we do not need the subsidiary conjecture of HUPFELD that the *Compiler* must have changed into 'Abram' and 'Sarai,' in xi.29,30,xii.1,4ª,6,7, &c. xvi.8, the 'Abraham' and 'Sarah,' which J must have used throughout in his original *independent* narrative,—since there is no sign of his giving any account of the change of these names,—in order to get rid of the glaring discrepancy which would otherwise exist, when the narratives of the Elohist and Jehovist were blended together into one. Nor are we troubled with the question which would then arise, *viz.* why the same cautious editorship did not also get rid of the still more glaring discrepancy, which arises from the use of the Divine Name by the Elohist, and his statement in E.vi.3, when compared with the language of the Jehovistic narrative.

# CHAPTER VIII.

## THE AGE OF THE ELOHIST.

90. HAVING thus obtained the Elohistic narrative of Genesis, almost in its entirety, and with a tolerable certainty, from the close agreement of three different independent examinations, that we have it here very fairly represented in its original form, we are now in a position to enquire what *signs of time* it furnishes, which may help us to form a judgment as to the age in which its author lived.

91. That the Elohist could not possibly have been an *older* writer than Moses, is obvious at once from the fact, that this document includes, as we see, the important passage, E.vi.2–7, which records the communication of the Divine Name to Moses, and which, of course, could not have been recorded by any one living before that event itself took place in the lifetime of Moses. We may confidently, therefore, dismiss at once the notion, to which some (as Bishop BROWNE) have had recourse, in order to obviate some of the manifest difficulties which beset the traditionary view, when the difference of style and tone in the different parts of Genesis is felt and acknowledged to be a plain fact,—*viz.* that Moses wrote the account of the matters in which he was himself concerned, but for the earlier events of human history had recourse to ancient records, and adopted them into his work.

92. We see, then, that the First Chapter of Genesis was written by the same hand which wrote the above section of Exodus.

The first accounts of the Creation and the Deluge, the earliest annals of the lives of any of the Patriarchs, of Adam and Noah, of Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob, are due to the very same author, who penned the narrative of the revelation of the name 'Jehovah' to Moses. And this narrative, if any portion of the Pentateuch is the work of Moses, must surely have been composed by Moses himself. Who, indeed, but he could have given a report of a transaction, in which no other human being took part but himself?

93. Was then Moses himself the Elohist? With our present knowledge of the composition of the Pentateuch, it is impossible to believe that he was. For it is now plain,—since the Elohist has never once used the name 'Jehovah' in his narrative, till he has reached the passage, E.vi.2-7, when he describes the revelation of the name to Moses,—that he meant it to be understood that the name was actually *unknown among men* till then. It is now no longer possible to evade the obvious meaning of the words, in E.vi.3,—

'I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name El Shaddai; but by My Name JEHOVAH was I not known to them.'

94. But then, if Moses himself described this event, he must have meant to represent it as having actually happened as an *historical fact*, or not.

If it was really recorded by Moses himself as an *historical fact*,—in this case, a fact of awful meaning and tremendous consequences,—it is impossible to believe that any other writers would have dared to obscure that fact,—much less, to contradict it,—by inserting narratives in which the name is put in the mouths of all the chief persons in the history from Eve, iv.1, downwards, and by observing that in the time of Seth—

'it was begun to call upon the name of Jehovah,' iv.26.

Or, if Moses wrote this account, but not as a piece of authentic history, then he must at least have meant it to be understood

that the use of this Divine Name originated with himself. And in that case also it is almost as incredible as before that other writers, with any due reverence for the work of the Great Lawgiver, should have so entirely stultified his purpose and contradicted his statement.

95. In short, we can only conceive that this might have been done in a later age, when the Elohist was known to have merely written a work of imagination,—devout, instructive, edifying, but not on that account historically true,—and when later writers, who were well aware that the name Jehovah had not originated in the way here described, may have considered it of less importance to adhere to the older statement, and may have thought it best to carry back the name to the oldest times. That the Jehovist, or the Later Compiler,—whoever put the Book into its present form,—has left this contradiction standing, is only what has occurred, as we have seen, in the case of many other similar discrepancies,—as in the two accounts of the Creation and the Deluge, and the others noticed above (55,57). But the contradiction in this instance stands out now more distinct and palpable than ever, when we have the Elohistic story separated by itself, and it is no longer possible, as we have said, to evade or explain away the meaning of the words,—

'By My Name JEHOVAH was I not known to them.'

96. Thus, from mere *à priori* considerations, and without examining into the actual contents of the narrative, we are able to conclude at once that the Elohist must have lived in a later day than Moses—in a later day, we may say, than any of the contemporaries of Moses, who would hardly have ventured to take such a liberty in describing these awful transactions, in which their own great leader was supposed to have been concerned. And this agrees fully with the conclusion to which we have been already brought, in considering the 'difficulties, contradictions, improbabilities, impossibilities,'—to use Dean MILMAN'S words—which are involved in the story of the Exodus

as it now lies before us. It is incredible that such a narrative could have been written by contemporaries and eyewitnesses. It is only conceivable as the result of an attempt to imagine in a much later day, with the help (it may be) of floating traditions, the possible incidents of the journey through the wilderness.

97. I. On giving our close attention to the Elohistic story, we cannot but be struck with the air of primitive simplicity which pervades the whole narrative, both as regards the *style* and as regards the *tone* of it. The *style* is grave, prosaic, unadorned, abounding with repetitions—yet not without a certain grandeur and majesty, which accords well with our conceptions of an ancient time, before the advance of literature and the progress of civilisation had supplied the language with the more refined and picturesque expressions, which we find so frequent with the Jehovist, but which are almost wholly wanting in the older writer. And the *tone* of the narrative is quite in keeping with the style—equally primitive and archaic, showing no sign of the vices and luxuries of a later more civilised age.

98. Thus, we observe that in the whole Elohistic narrative there is no instance of a story of *indecency*—adultery, fornication, incest—such as abound with the Jehovist. The crimes, which he refers to as most common, are crimes of 'violence,' which, according to him, caused the Flood, vi.11,13, and against which he expressly provides in ix.5,6—

'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.'

His constant formula of blessing is 'fructify and multiply.' The account which he gives of the Creation is far more simple and natural, as the conception of a rude age, than the highly-wrought artistic narrative of the Jehovist, with its speculations as to the formation of woman, the invention of clothing, the origin of pain and labour, sin, and death. And his beautiful imagination of the rainbow as the sign of God's mercy, ix.12–17, contrasts with the Jehovist's more subtle and artificial notion,

that the sweat of the brow and the pains of childbirth are only to be regarded as tokens of a curse.

99. II. Again, the idea that mankind lived first on vegetable food, and were not allowed to eat the flesh of animals till after the Flood, belongs to an earlier age than the Jehovist's view, that animals were killed, and no doubt eaten, from the first, as appears from his stating that their skins were used for clothing, and their fat, as the richest part of the meat, burnt in sacrifice. But the Elohist makes no mention of sacrifices at all, nor of priests or tithes. All that Jacob does, when he sets up his pillar at Bethel, and calls the place the 'House of Elohim,' is to 'pour a drink-offering and oil' upon it, xxxv.14. That priests existed, and sacrifices were offered, in his day in Israel, as among the other surrounding nations, can scarcely be doubted; as the stress laid by him upon the rest of the Seventh Day, ii.1–4$^{a}$, shows also that in his days the Sabbath was observed. Yet clearly this writer laid no special stress on *priestly* authority. He lived, we may believe, in a day, when there was no formal ritual, no magnificent temple, no regular system of sacrifices.

100. III. Further, we find in the Elohist no mention of *houses*, or any of the conveniences of later civilised life. Noah is commanded, indeed, to build an Ark, is ordered generally to make it into 'nests'—to 'pitch it within and without,' vi.14. But the further details of its construction—the measures of its length, and breadth, and height,—the account of its 'window,' and 'door,' and 'roof,' and 'three stories,'—are, as we believe, due to the hand of the Jehovist, vi.15,16. And so, though the Elohist speaks of the abundance of *cattle* possessed by Abram and Lot, xiii.6, by Esau and Jacob, xxxvi.6,7, *comp.* xiii.5,xxxi.18,xlvi.6, yet he nowhere says that Abraham was 'rich in silver and gold,' nor refers even to his possessing 'camels.'

101. Only in one place does he mention the precious metals, and that is in xxiii.16, where Abraham *weighs* out to Ephron

400 shekels of silver, 'passing current with the trader' or *pedlar*. Thus the Elohist evidently lived before the time when Solomon 'made silver to be in Jerusalem as stones,' 1K.x.27, whatever may have been the real state of things answering to this exaggerated form of expression. Commerce appears to have been yet in its infancy: he knows nothing of precious stones, of golden *bracelets*, *earrings*, or *necklaces*: he never even mentions the *sword*. His language betrays everywhere a primitive condition of society, before the arts had made much progress in Israel.

102. IV. We observe further that, although Manasseh was the firstborn of the two sons of Joseph, and as such he is named by the Elohist himself in xlvi.20, yet in Jacob's last words to Joseph, as recorded by this writer in xlviii.5, Ephraim is set before Manasseh, and both are reckoned as tribes of Israel,—'as Reuben and Simeon they shall be mine.'

This prevents our assigning the composition of this Book to an *earlier* period in the history of the Judges than the time of Gideon, or even Jephthah, about fifty years before Samuel, in whose time the pre-eminence of Ephraim among the northern tribes was not yet fully recognised; whereas, in the preceding part of the narrative, Manasseh was most prominent through its hero, Gideon, Ju.vi.15. And after his death, his sons, Manassites, seem to have exercised some kind of supreme authority, Ju.ix.2. One of them, in fact, was actually made king, though by the help of his mother's tribe of Ephraim, and with the massacre of all his father's house, Ju.ix.5,6. His reign was of very short duration; and we hear no more of any distinction obtained by the tribe of Manasseh.

103. But from this time forward—*i.e.* for about a century (according to the account in the Book of Judges) before the time of Samuel—the power of Ephraim waxed ever greater and greater. Even in Gideon's days, when he had summoned to

his help his own tribe, and those of Asher, Zebulun, and Naphtali, Ju.vi.35, we are told, viii.1, that—

'the men of Ephraim said unto him, Why hast thou served us thus, that thou calledst us not, when thou wentest to fight with the Midianites? And they did chide with him sharply.'

They helped his son, Abimelech, as we have said, to the kingdom,—but mainly, it would seem, because their proud spirit could ill brook the lordship of his Manassite relatives.

104. About fifty years before Samuel they acted towards Jephthah the Gileadite, as they had done towards Gideon, but even more fiercely, threatening to 'burn him and his house with fire,' Ju.xii.1, because he had not called them to go with him to the war against the children of Ammon. It is obvious that their anger was aroused on these occasions, not through the loss of a good opportunity of fighting or plundering, but from resentment at the fact, that their pre-eminence, as the leading tribe, had not been duly recognised by Gideon and Jephthah, who had undertaken important military expeditions, and summoned the other tribes to aid them, without first consulting the tribe of Ephraim. We are told that upon this Jephthah gathered all his forces, and slew of the Ephraimites 42,000 men, Ju.xii.4–6. The number of the slain is, of course, as usual, an enormous exaggeration; but we may take it as a fact that Jephthah gained a decisive victory, with considerable bloodshed.

105. At last, in Samuel's time, the tribe of Ephraim seems to have overshadowed with its influence all the other tribes, except that of Judah. Ephraim, doubtless, was the main support of Ishbosheth's power, when after the death of Saul Abner made him king—

'over Gilead, and the Asherites, and over Jezreel, and over *Ephraim*, and over Benjamin, and over all Israel,' 2S.ii.9—

whereas David was recognised and supported by Judah. After the death of Ishbosheth, at the end of 7½ years, 'all the tribes' came to David, and made him king over 'all Israel,' 2S.v.1–3.

And so, after the death of Absalom, when David had been brought back from Jerusalem, chiefly by the men of Judah, we read, 2S.xix.43—

'all the men of Israel came to the king, and the men of Israel answered the men of Judah and said, We have ten parts in the king, and we have also more right in David than ye.'

That these 'men of Israel' were headed by the men of Ephraim we cannot doubt, as we know that within fifty years, in the time of David's grandson, Rehoboam, when the Ten Tribes revolted from the supremacy of Judah, and formed a separate confederacy, they were commonly spoken of as the 'House of Ephraim' or the 'House of Joseph.'

106. Already the above phenomena are pointing towards the age of *Samuel*, as, most probably, the age of the Elohist. If Moses was not the writer, nor any of his contemporaries, as we have before concluded, there is no portion of the history, as it has come down to us, in which we can conceive such a narrative as this to have been written, *before* Samuel's age, and no person that we read of as at all likely to have written it, until we come to Samuel himself, to whom certainly tradition points as having concerned himself in writing history. On the other hand, the facts to which we have just drawn attention, prevent our supposing that this Elohistic narrative,—if reflecting the natural spirit of the age in which it was written,—if not fictitiously contrived to set forth the manners of an earlier age, (of which there is no indication whatever,)—can have been composed in *later* days than Samuel's.

107. Even in David's time the arts had made some progress in Israel; whereas in that of Samuel, we read, 1S.xiii.19,20,—

'There was no smith found throughout all the land of Israel; for the Philistines said, Lest the Hebrews make them swords or spears. But all the Israelites went down to the Philistines, to sharpen every man his share, and his coulter, and his ax, and his mattock. Yet they had a file for the mattocks and for the coulters and for the forks and for the axes, and to sharpen the goads. So it came to pass

in the day of battle that there was neither sword nor spear found in the hand of the people that were with Saul and Jonathan: but with Saul and with Jonathan his son was there found.'

In David's time also, after the erection of the Tabernacle on Mount Zion, 2S.vi.17, the sacrificial system must have become too prominent, we may believe, to have left no trace whatever of its existence in such a work as this, if composed in that age.

And in David's time, also, civilisation and even luxury had made such considerable advances in Israel, that David's own house was built of cedar, 2S.v.11, and gold, silver, and bronze, had become abundant in Jerusalem, 2S.viii.7,8,10,11.

Thus, while (IV) seems to fix the age of the Elohist not *earlier* than the time of Jephthah, *fifty years before* SAMUEL (104), on the other hand (I), (II), (III), seem to fix it not *later* than the time of David, *shortly after* SAMUEL.

108. V. Let us, in the next place, observe what a stress the Elohist lays, xxxv.11, upon the fact that '*a nation*, and *a company of nations*,' should spring out of Jacob's loins. He names the twelve tribes, xxxv.22$^{b}$–26,xlvi.8–27, E.i.2-5; they form together a 'company of nations'; but he speaks of them also as forming '*a* nation,' *one* people—united, therefore, it would seem under a king. No reference is made to their forming *two* nations, as 'Judah' and 'Israel.' There is no enmity whatever implied in the Elohistic account between *Joseph* and his brethren. The children of Israel are plainly still united in one body. And if, as we have seen, this narrative cannot have been written in the days of Solomon or even of David, there remains only the age of Saul for its composition, that is, the age of SAMUEL.

109. VI. We notice again that there is no sign in the Elohistic narrative of any *enmity* existing between Esau and Jacob, that is, of course, between Edom and Israel. On the contrary Esau and Jacob are represented as in amicable relations, burying their father together, xxxv.29, just as Ishmael and Isaac had

buried Abraham, xxv.9. And Esau, in the most friendly manner, goes away from the land of Canaan to settle in Edom, merely to allow room for his brother;—

'for their gain was great, above dwelling together; and the land of their sojournings was not able to bear them because of their cattle,' xxxvi.6,7.

110. So far, indeed, is this writer from showing any hostility against the Edomites, that he appears to have been greatly interested in the affairs of that people. He mentions, indeed, particularly, that Esau had grieved his father by marrying two Hittite wives, xxvi.34,35, and that he had then tried to mend matters by marrying one of Ishmael's daughters, xxviii.8,9,—facts, which, no doubt, had some relation to the actual condition of the Edomite people, who had formed a closer union than their relatives, the Israelites, with the Canaanites and Hagarenes. But in naming these wives he falls into contradiction; since the names given in xxvi.34, xxviii.9, do not agree with those in xxxvi.2,3. This may show some uncertainty in the traditions, or in the information which he had gathered at different times.

111. But in xxxvi he enters into a long account of the progeny of Esau, and the different clans which sprung from him, showing considerable acquaintance with the details of their national history, and exhibiting an amount of interest in their affairs only second to that which he felt in respect of those of his own people. And it seems impossible to suppose that such labour would have been expended on the annals of these tribes,—without the slightest reference to any rivalry or ill-blood between them and the tribes of Israel,—*at any period after the time of David*, when the feeling between the Edomites and Israelites must have been very bitter, since David we are told, 2S.viii.14,—

'put garrisons in Edom—throughout all Edom put he garrisons—and all they of Edom became David's servants';

and we read also that in David's time, 1K.xi.16,—

'six months did Joab remain there with all Israel, until he had cut off every male in Edom.'

112. Saul, it is true, is said to have 'fought against Edom,' 1S.xiv.47, among his other enemies. But there is no sign that in his time that intense mutual hatred had developed itself, which in after days burned so fiercely, and was not even slaked on the part of Edom by the blood which 'was shed like water on all sides of Jerusalem,' when that city fell into the hands of the king of Babylon; see 2Ch.xxv.11,12, Ob.10–14, Ez.xxv.12–14.

Again, therefore, we seem to be brought back, by this consideration also—of the friendly, or at least not bitterly hostile and deadly, feelings represented by the Elohist as existing between Esau and Jacob=Edom and Israel—to *an age not later than the time of* SAMUEL.

113. VII. In xxxvi.31, the Elohist writes:—

'These are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, *before there reigned any king over the children of Israel.*'

Here it seems to be implied—

(i) That at the time when these words were written, there *was* a king reigning over Israel;

(ii) That he was reigning over *all* Israel, so that the separation of the Ten Tribes had not yet taken place.

We are thus restricted to the days of *Saul*, *David*, or *Solomon*. And, if, as we have seen already, the signs of a more primitive state of civilisation, which this narrative betrays, forbids our assigning it to the age of Solomon, or even to the later days of David, we are once more referred to the earlier part of David's reign, or to the time of Saul,—in other words, to the age of SAMUEL.

114. VIII. And this seems also to be indicated by the great stress laid in the promises to Abraham and Jacob, that 'kings' should spring out of them:—

'Kings shall go-forth out of thee,' xvii.6;

'Kings of peoples shall be out of her,' xvii.16;

'Kings shall go-forth out of thy loins,' xxxv.11.

It is observable that in the reference to Sarah in xvii.16 the expression 'kings of *peoples*' is used, implying that more than one people having kings should spring from the loins of Abraham, —a prediction which was not fulfilled till both *Edom* and *Israel* had kings. But this happened first in the days of Saul; for Ishmael's progeny are spoken of as 'twelve *princes*,' and not as 'kings.' In fact, they never appear to have formed *a nation* under *one sole king*, as Edom and Israel. And, obviously, it is more natural—supposing the Elohist to be writing *post eventum*, and describing in the way of prediction the actual state of things in his own time,—that he should lay this stress upon the kingdom, when it was comparatively *recent* and *remarkable*, rather than when it was a matter of long experience, a thing of course. Thus we are brought once more to the same age, the age of SAMUEL as most probably that of the Elohist.

115. IX. Again the Elohist tells us in xxxvi.39—

'And Hadar reigned in his stead; and the name of his city is Pau, and his wife's name Mehetabel, daughter of Matred, daughter of Mezahab.'

This is the only one of the Edomite kings, about whom any such details are given; and this is the *last* of them. It would seem that the family relations of Hadar were well-known to the writer; and the most probable inference is that he was a *contemporary* of this king. In fact, it is not said of Hadar, as of each of his predecessors, that 'he died,'—which seems to be a token that he was still alive and reigning when the Elohist wrote. Accordingly, the Chronicler, writing long after the Captivity, and evidently copying this chapter of Genesis, adds also for Hadar or, as he calls him, Hadad, 'Hadad died also,' 1Ch.i.51.

116. Now in 1K.xi.15–22 we read that Hadad 'of the king's seed in Edom,' who had escaped, when a 'little child,' from the massacre of 'all the males' of Edom, which Joab made during six months together in the time of David, returned,

as soon as he heard of the death of David and that of Joab, to his native land, having 'found great favour with Pharaoh king of Egypt,' and having married the sister of his queen. This Hadad then, who was a child in the fifteenth year of David's reign, may very well have been the *grandson* of the last king of Edom, mentioned by the Elohist; whose *son*, we may suppose,—perhaps the reigning king at the time,—was 'cut-off' by Joab; for the name, which means 'splendour,' and 'belonged to the Sun in Aramæan mythology,' KURTZ, iii. *p.* 342, was evidently a family-name, and was borne as we see by a former great ancestor, *v.*35, whose 'city was Avith,' and who is distinguished (in a note of the Jehovist) as the king—

'Who smote Midian in the field of Moab.'

Once more, then, we are brought back to the age of SAMUEL.

# CHAPTER IX

## THE AGE OF THE ELOHIST (CONTINUED).

117. In addition to the arguments which have been already advanced, in order to determine the age of the Elohist, we may further observe that this writer lays very great stress upon the purchase by Abraham, from the sons of Heth, of the field of Machpelah, and upon the burial of Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebekah, Jacob and Leah, in the cave of the field so purchased, xxv.9,10, xxxv.27, xlix.29–32, l.13. Again and again he describes this field with minute particularity and almost legal precision, *e.g.*:—

'The field of Ephron which was in Machpelah, which was east of Mamre, the field and the cave which was therein, and all the trees that were in the field, that were in all the borders round-about, (stood=) were conveyed unto Abraham for a possession in the presence of the children of Heth, before all that went in at the gate of the city. And afterwards Abraham buried Sarah his wife in the cave of the field of Machpelah east of Mamre. And the field, and the cave that is therein, were conveyed unto Abraham for a possession of a burying-place by the sons of Heth.' xxiii.17–20.

Compare also the similar definitions repeated at some length in the other passages above quoted.

118. Now the object of this reiterated notice of Abraham's acquisition by purchase of the field of Machpelah lies revealed apparently in the note of the later Editor—'that is *Hebron* in the land of Canaan,' xxiii.2,19. The Elohist wished it to be understood that this place was the most venerable and sacred in the whole land of Israel, and ought to be held dear to the heart of

every Israelite. From the earliest times it had been possessed by Abraham, not by conquest, but by purchase from the sons of Heth; nay, it had been offered as a friendly gift; and only refused as such by the Patriarch, that he might secure for himself and his descendants for ever an incontestable right to it, by paying the full price for it—'four-hundred shekels of silver.' And, since that time, it had been consecrated by having been made (according to the Elohist) the sole place of residence of each of the Patriarchs, xxv.9, xxxv.27, xlix.31, and by having received the bones of each of them, and those of all their wives, except Rachel. How dear then should *Hebron* be to the affections of every Israelite! How touching and how venerable were all these associations connected with it!

119. But why so much stress laid upon *Hebron*?

If we turn to the history we read that, after Saul's death,—

'David enquired of Jehovah saying, Shall I go up into any of the cities of Judah? And Jehovah said unto him, Go up. And David said, Whither shall I go up? And He said, Unto *Hebron*.' 2S.ii.1.

Thus by express Divine command, it would seem—that is, we must suppose, by the authority of some Priest or Prophet—David was directed to make *Hebron* the centre of his power, the seat of his government. Accordingly, for seven years and a half, David 'was king in *Hebron* over the house of Judah,' *v.*11, while Ishbosheth reigned over the other tribes at Mahanaim, *v.*8. At *Hebron* David's first six sons were born to him, 2S.iii.5, and thither after Ishbosheth's death, 'came all the tribes of Israel' to make David king over all Israel, 2S.iv.1.

'So all the elders of Israel came to the king to *Hebron*; and king David made a league with them in *Hebron* before Jehovah; and they anointed David king over Israel . . . In *Hebron* he reigned over Judah seven years and six months; and in *Jerusalem* he reigned thirty and three years over all Israel and Judah,' *v.*3,5.

120. After this Hebron disappears from the history altogether, except that Absalom begins his rebellion by asking leave to go

to pay a vow 'unto Jehovah at *Hebron*,' 2S.xv.7, and at *Hebron* he also presently sets up his kingdom, *v.*10.

It would seem, then, highly improbable that all this importance should have been ascribed by the Elohistic writer to Hebron, if he wrote *after* the first few years of David's reign, when he had captured the fortress of Zion, and made *Jerusalem* his royal city, 2S.v.6–9. But it is clear that the intention of David's prophetical or priestly advisers was to have made *Hebron* the capital. It seems probable that with a view to this the passages before us were written. They were meant to attach a special sacredness to Hebron in the minds of all true Israelites, and to secure therefore to David at first a certain amount of prestige in setting up his kingdom there.

121. Again, then, we are taken back to the latter days of Saul and the age of SAMUEL, as the time when most probably these words were written—when the Seer had broken finally with the insubordinate king, 1S.xv.35, but still lived on for some years, and appears to have distinctly patronised David. Thus on one occasion, we are told,—

'David fled and escaped and came to Samuel to Ramah, and told him all that Saul had done to him. And *he and Samuel* went and dwelt at Naioth . . . And he (Saul) asked and said, Where are *Samuel and David*? And one said, Behold, they are at Naioth in Ramah.' 1S.xix.18,19,22.

At this very time, it may be, the Prophet had the Elohistic story in his hands, and may have laid this special stress on Hebron, in conformity with advice which he himself may have given to David, to make this place his future capital.

122. What, indeed, is more likely than that Samuel, after anointing David to be the future king, should have done his best to strengthen his hands and assist his first access to the throne? Samuel lived, we are told, three years after that anointing; and, though the chronology of the early days of David is certainly very much confused in the history, (*comp.*, for instance, 1S.xvi.17–23 with xvii.55–58), yet we may well believe that

the Seer, who knew David so intimately, xix.18, was well aware before his death of his being 'a mighty valiant man, and prudent in matters, and Jehovah was with him,' xvi.18—of his having been 'set over Saul's men of war, and accepted of all the people, and also in the sight of Saul's servants,' xviii. 5—of his 'behaving wisely in all his ways, so that Saul was afraid of him, but all Israel and Judah loved David, because he went out and came in before them,' xviii.14–16.

123. Samuel would have also known, we may suppose, of David's gallant actions in the field, when he slew Goliath, or when with his own hand he killed two hundred (?) Philistines and won the king's daughter, xviii.27, or when he—

'went to Keilah, and fought with the Philistines, and brought away their cattle, and smote them with a great slaughter,' xxiii.5,—

all which facts are recorded as having happened before his death. He must have known, too, of Jonathan's regard for David, and that he would put no obstacle in the way of David's succeeding to the kingdom. He may have heard from David himself how Jonathan went to him in the wood of the wilderness of Ziph, and 'strengthened his hand in God,'—

'and he said unto him, Fear not; for the hand of Saul my father shall not find thee; and thou shalt be king over Israel, and I shall be next unto thee; and that also Saul my father knoweth,' xxiii.16,17.

124. Thus we have Samuel before his death in close and intimate relations with David, and fully aware, it would seem, of the circumstances which pointed to his future destiny, and marked him out as the successor of Saul upon the throne of Israel. Is it too much to suppose that he may have advised his protégé,—whom he found more docile and tractable than Saul, and whom he appears to have had in his eye for some time past as the future king, 1S.xv.28, xvi.13,—to set up his throne in Hebron, when the time of his exaltation came,—or that the prophets or priests, who advised David to take this step on that occasion, had received their instructions

long before from their aged Master, whom we know to have been an eminent Statesman, as well as a Prophet and a Priest?

125. In short, all Samuel's hopes for Israel must, it would seem, have been centred in David, now that he had utterly despaired of Saul. When he surrendered,—very unwillingly indeed, 1S.viii.6,7,—the reins of government himself, he may have expected very naturally to exercise a powerful influence for good upon the mind of the first king, whom he himself had been the instrument of choosing and raising to the throne; and thus he may have hoped to have still carried on through his agency the plans, which his religious and patriotic heart had conceived, for the improvement and education of the people. Disappointed in this, he turned at last from the self-willed and unmanageable Saul to the more congenial spirit of David, and found in him a much more willing listener. What more likely than that in these last three years he should have talked over with him the whole subject of his future rule, while David 'stayed with him at Ramah,' xix.18,—have cheered and encouraged him with his counsel, and given him advice, from the experience of his own long life, on many important matters of religion and politics? Among other things he may have advised him, as we have said, to make Hebron the seat of his government, and may have written the passages before us with a view to that event.

126. We have thus a number of concurrent arguments all pointing in the same direction to the age of SAMUEL, as that of the Elohistic writer of the Pentateuch. There are some other points which may be noticed, though they derive their value from the preceding evidence, and would have no force without it, or could only have been quoted as singular coincidences.

Thus the express limitation of the promise of territory to 'all the land of Canaan,' the 'land of the sojournings' of the

Patriarchs, xvii.8,xxviii.4,xxxv.12, implies a time *before the extensive conquests of David*, which are described as reaching as far as the Euphrates, 1K.iv.21, and which certainly included the districts of Moab, 2S.viii.2, Edom, *v.*14, and Damascus, *v.*6.

127. Some particular stress also is laid on *Bethel*, as a holy place, which Jacob had consecrated, xxxv.14,15, in remembrance of the appearance of El Shaddai to him. And Bethel, we find, was a notable place of worship in *Samuel's* days,—

'there shall meet thee three men going-up to Elohim at Bethel,' 1S.x.3—

for which reason, no doubt, it was not only chosen by him as one of the four places where he judged the people, 1S.vii.16, but was also specially selected by Jeroboam, as the place where one of his two calves should be set, 1K.xii.29.

128. Again, a special stress is laid by the Elohist on the duty of not eating *blood*:—

'Flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat,' ix.4.

Were these words written with a view to check the practice which, as KALISCH notes, is still customary among some tribes of Syria, and into which the Israelites rushed on one memorable occasion in *Samuel's* time, as recorded in 1S.xiv.32,33?—

'And the people flew upon the spoil, and took sheep and oxen and calves, and slew them on the ground; and the people did eat them with the blood. Then they told Saul saying, Behold! the people sin against Jehovah, in that they eat with the blood. And he said, Ye have transgressed.'

129. Further, in xvii.9–14 the practice of circumcision is represented as peculiar to Abraham and his seed. Yet it existed already in Egypt and elsewhere;* and according to HERODOTUS,

* The following remarks of KALISCH are worthy of attention, *Gen.p.*386, &c. 'Circumcision seems to have been first practised by the Ethiopians and other nations of Southern Africa. But it was, from very ancient times, spread to the south and west; it was, among some nations, performed upon both sexes, as is still the case among the Abyssinian Christians; it is in use among the Kafir tribes of South Africa, especially the Amakosa Kafirs—[it was among the Zulus, till their

ii.204, the Hebrews admitted that they had borrowed the rite from the Egyptians:—

> Alone of all men, the Colchians, Egyptians, and Ethiopians, circumcise from the earliest times. And the Phœnicians too, and *Syrians in Palestine*, confess that they have learned the practice from the Egyptians.

On the traditionary view, it would of course be amazing that

late king, Chaka, forbad it]—and it has been discovered in many southern islands of the Indian Seas and the Pacific Ocean.

'The question arises, What was the origin of this singular custom? It must evidently have a general cause, inherent either in the human mind, or in the human frame, since it was in use among so many different nations, having no mutual intercourse. Now a *religious* motive seems to be out of the question; for some of the nations alluded to are strangers to all religious ceremonies. There is, therefore, scarcely a doubt that in those southern countries the rite of circumcision was introduced from a *physical* cause. It was not only a matter of expediency, but in some cases of necessity. PHILO distinctly observes that it prevents the painful, and often incurable, disease of carbuncle; it further obviates some fearful disorders (*phimosis, gonorrhœa spuria*); modern travellers testify that it precludes great physical inconvenience among the Bushmen; and the Christian missionaries, who exerted themselves for its abolition in Abyssinia, were, by the dangerous physical consequences, compelled to desist from their plans.

'From the south it spread northward into Egypt. Many parts of this country were colonised from Ethiopia; and the intercourse with Ethiopia was both constant and animated. Now the same complaints, to which we have before referred as frequent in Ethiopia, may, in many instances, have appeared in Egypt also; and circumcision may, therefore, as a matter of precaution, have been gradually adopted by all Egyptians. But it recommended itself also to this people from another consideration, in their view of the highest importance,—that of cleanliness. 'They are circumcised,' says HERODOTUS, 'for the sake of cleanliness, thinking it better to be clean than handsome.' There is no doubt whatever that, during many centuries, that rite was performed by all classes of the Egyytians and by the whole nation. The examination of the mummies,—the fact that the Colchians, who were Egyptian settlers, belonging to the army of Sesostris, performed the ceremony,—and the accounts of HERODOTUS, DIODORUS SICULUS, PHILO, and STRABO, concur to prove that circumcision was a general and national institution among the Egyptians.

'Among the nations, which derived the custom of circumcision from the Egyptians, were undoubtedly the Hebrews. Mosaism was compelled to retain it on account of the ignominy with which its neglect was regarded by neighbouring nations, Jo.v.9,—where the writer speaks of the 'reproach of Egypt' being rolled away from them—and in consequence by the Hebrews themselves, G.xxxiv.14.'

*Moses* should have recorded here, as the solemn declaration of Almighty God,—

'the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut-off from his people,' xvii.14—

and yet have allowed his own son to remain uncircumcised, E.iv.25,—still more that he should have allowed all the Israelites, who were born in the wilderness, to have remained uncircumcised for forty years, Jo.v.5, especially as they continued many months together at Sinai and at other different resting-places, and had so many days of very solemn religious services.

130. But, if this section was written (as we have seen good ground to conclude) in the days of *Samuel*, we are reminded that the expression 'uncircumcised' is only used in the history with reference to the *Philistines*, and then *only* in the days of Samson, Ju.xiv.3, xv.18, and *Saul*, 1S.xiv.6, xvii.26,36, xxxi.4, 2S.i.20. And, in fact, as the Phœnicians, certainly, and, perhaps, the Canaanites, generally, practised circumcision, the Philistines may have been the only uncircumcised persons in Canaan. Now, it is generally agreed that the Philistines had taken possession of the coast of Palestine not very long before the time of Samuel. They are not named at all in the older portions of the Pentateuch: and their name means 'foreigners,' and so is rendered by the LXX, Ἀλλοφύλοι. In any case, however, the coincidence above noted is remarkable.

131. We have now completed our examination of the Elohistic document for signs of time. And I think it will be conceded that the suggestion, which I hazarded in my Second Part, that SAMUEL may have been the Elohist, is not so rash and groundless as some have supposed. It appears to me that we have traced the composition of this document with a very considerable amount of probability to the age—and if so, then probably, to the hand—of SAMUEL. When I first made this suggestion, I had not met with any confirmation of my own

conjecture in the works of other critics. I had been led to it merely by the consideration of the evidence which I had then before me, but which, after much labour spent in perfecting the Analysis, I have now before me much more clearly, and have endeavoured to set before the reader. Since then, however, I find that TUCH has written as follows, *Genesis*, *p.*xciv :—

Who the author was, we cannot decide. We might imagine SAMUEL, and regard the Elohistic narrative as the last service which the Seer, retired from public state-affairs, in the evening of his life, rendered to the people who had owed their deliverance to him.

132. BOEHMER, also, concludes as follows, *p.*23,24 :—

A Samuel would not have opposed the introduction of the kingdom in Israel, if he had known that God had promised to his people kings of their own; and, if Samuel knew nothing of this, then, generally, a divine utterance of this kind cannot have at all existed [in his time]. This narrative, in which we read that promise, xvii.6,16, xxxv.11, cannot, therefore, have been composed *before the time of Saul.* The express mention of Hebron, as the place where Abraham buys a family-sepulchre, and besides which no other place of residence is named for Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, (except the Aramaic abode of the latter,) while in the later accounts the Patriarchs are represented as living also at many other places, leads to the conjecture that this narrative owes its origin probably to *the first septennium of David's reign*, when he lived at that place. Against the age of Solomon, as the time of its composition, great weight must be allowed to the circumstance, that by this writer of the Pentateuch no mention whatever is made of Jerusalem.

133. With the first and last of the above observations of BOEHMER I entirely concur. It is impossible to suppose that Samuel would have resisted the appointment of a king, in the way in which he is represented as resisting it, telling them that their 'wickedness was great, which they had done in the sight of Jehovah, in asking for themselves a king,' 1S.xii.17, if Jehovah Himself had actually promised, as part of the special blessing upon Abraham and Jacob, that 'kings' should be born to them. It is equally incredible that, if the people knew of this promise, they should never have pleaded it, in excuse, at all events—if not rather in support—of their desire, instead of saying, as they are made to say, *v.*19—

'Pray for thy servants unto Jehovah thy Elohim, that we die not; for we have added unto all our sins this evil, to ask us a king.'

Samuel, at any rate, must have known of this promise, if it really existed in writing in his time, and could scarcely have passed it over in utter silence.

So, too, the fact that the Elohist makes not the slightest reference to Jerusalem or the Temple—to any ritual, priesthood, or sacrificial system—is a strong argument against the supposition, that this narrative was composed in the days of Solomon or in the latter part of David's reign.

134. BOEHMER, however, fixes the composition of this narrative within the first seven years of David's reign. The difference between this view and our own is very inconsiderable. But why must the age of the Elohist be carried quite so low?

Surely, Samuel, though he objected to the kingdom at first, may have acquiesced in it as a fact of providence, and is described as having done so fully in the account given us in 1S.xii.13–25:—

'Now, therefore, behold the king whom ye have chosen, whom ye have desired! and behold! Jehovah hath set a king over you. If ye will fear Jehovah, &c. then shall both ye and also the king that reigneth over you continue after Jehovah your Elohim, &c. But, if ye shall still do wickedly, ye shall be consumed, both ye and your king.'

135. In short, if there is any truth at all in the tradition, that Samuel had a band of young men—a 'school of prophets'—under his training, it seems almost a matter of necessity that he should have sought to provide them with instruction of some kind as to the earlier history of Israel, with a view—not only to their own improvement, but also—to their communicating the same in their teachings to their fellow-countrymen. They had no Bible in their hands—no body of divinity to study; they must have had some occupation besides merely the chanting of psalms. If he exerted himself at all for the education of these youths, can anything be conceived more likely than that he should have done his best to prepare for them such a narrative as this? The art of writing was at this time, most probably, possessed by the Phœnicians, and may from them have

passed over to the Israelites. Other attempts at historical composition may, of course,—or, rather, must—have preceded this. But, since so many indications point clearly in this direction, I feel some confidence in repeating my previously-expressed conviction, that the Elohistic story is certainly due to the age, and very probably to the hand, of SAMUEL.

# CHAPTER X.

## THE AGE OF THE JEHOVIST.

136. We shall now proceed to consider the signs of time, which disclose themselves in the Jehovistic portions of Genesis, including those of the second Elohist, whose age must certainly lie (as is generally admitted) between that of the Elohist and Jehovist. We might here fairly start with the assumption, that the Elohistic story, which was manifestly a mere sketch, would naturally, if it originated (as we have seen reason to suppose) with Samuel, have been carried on by his disciples—the prophets of that age—of whom some, at all events, as Nathan and Gad, are named by the later tradition as writers of history, 1Ch.xxix.29.

137. If our first step in this argument is sound, and the main conclusion of the preceding chapter is admitted, that Samuel was very probably the Elohist, it would seem almost certain that this would happen. Their Master's story might have been left in their hands unfinished: they might have been advised by him, or charged, to complete it: or their own views of duty might have led them to do so. Even during his lifetime, and under his eye and direction, they may have been practised already in such labours; and the 'Book of the Wars of Jehovah' and the 'Book of Jasher' may have been the products of this time. All this appears to us in the highest degree probable: but we lay no stress upon it. We shall examine the Jehovistic narrative upon its own basis, and see what indications it will furnish as to the age of its writer.

138. Here, however, we have to bear in mind that the Jehovistic sections may very possibly or even probably not have been all written in the same age. And, in those days, when the intercourse of the Hebrews with the outer world increased so rapidly, through the conquests and alliances of David and the extended commerce of Solomon, we may expect to find indications of some difference in their relations to it betrayed in different parts of the Jehovistic narrative. We have only this to guide us, that the more thoroughly Jehovistic passages seem to have been written at a later period than those in which 'Elohim' occurs exclusively, *viz.* ($E_2$). And, although the style of the Jehovist is throughout more free and easy than that of the Second Elohist, and has many picturesque expressions which are almost wholly wanting with the latter, yet this, instead of marking a difference of style between two different writers, *may* be merely an indication of some advance in literature, and increased practice in composition.

139. I. First, then, the extended geographical knowledge exhibited in G.ii.11–14, and more particularly in G.x, points to a later age than Samuel's. And, indeed, these chapters can scarcely be supposed to have been written—especially the last—*before the age of Solomon*; though the friendly intercourse with the Phœnicians, which began even in David's reign, 2S.v.11, and David's own extensive conquests, 2S.viii, may have done something to enlarge the acquaintance of the Hebrews with foreign countries. It is plain, however, that, when such chapters as these were written, the people must have passed out of the mere agricultural condition in which they were living in the time of Samuel, and had begun to have freer intercourse with surrounding nations, and more especially with the maritime people of Tyre and Sidon.

140. II. A similar indication is given by the signs of advance

in civilisation and even luxury, which we find in various Jehovistic passages. It is this writer who tells us of—

'the land of Havilah, where there is gold; and the gold of that land is good; there is bdellium and the onyx-stone,' ii.11,12.

It is he who refers to instruments of music, iv.21, to 'working in brass and iron,' iv.22, (whereas in Saul's time, 'there was no smith found throughout all the land of Israel,' 1S.xiii.19,) to Abram's being rich, not only in flocks and herds, but in 'camels' and 'he-asses,' xxiv.35, and who says the same of Jacob, xxx.43, xxxii.7,8. But Abraham also, according to him, was wealthy in 'silver and gold,' xiii.2, xxiv.35; and a 'golden earring and bracelets,' 'jewels of silver and jewels of gold,' are produced out of his treasures, xxiv.22,53.

141. It is remarkable also that the word 'servant' never occurs with the Elohist, whereas in the rest of Genesis we find it *ninety-six* times; and mention is made by him of 'servants of Pharaoh,' 'servants of Abimelech,' as in later days we read of the 'servants' of Saul, 1S.xvi.15, of Achish, xxi.11, David, 2S.ii.13, Absalom, xvii.20, Hiram and Solomon, 1K.ix.27. So the Jehovist speaks repeatedly of the large household of 'men-servants,' and 'maid-servants,' which belonged to Abraham, xxiv.35, to Isaac, xxvi.14, and to Jacob, xxx.43, xxxii.5. Is this also an indication of a somewhat later age than that of the Elohist, in whose days, probably, no such large households existed as in the days of David and Solomon—the days of 'singing men and singing women,' 2S.xix.35,—when the kings, in accordance with Samuel's warning, had taken the 'sons' of Israel for drivers and horsemen and runners, and the 'daughters' for confectioners and cooks, 1S.viii.11,13? May not this language, in short, be evidence of the style of one used to the customs of *Courts*, and who accordingly makes Abraham and Isaac residing on friendly terms with Pharaoh and Abimelech, which the Elohist never does?

142. III. In these parts of Genesis also we find a considerable

acquaintance with Egyptian affairs—some knowledge of Egyptian words (*Anal.*294.iii), and Egyptian customs, xxxix.20, xliii.32, xlvi.34, xlvii.26,l.3. These accounts are not, perhaps, in all points, strictly accurate; but they are such as might very well have arisen from the closer contact between Israel and Egypt in the beginning of Solomon's reign, when he 'made affinity with Pharaoh king of Egypt, and took Pharaoh's daughter,' 1K.iii.1, or even in the middle of David's time, when clearly the growing power of David must have attracted attention in Egypt, and probably led to some friendly intercourse, which prepared the way for Solomon's marriage.

143. IV. In one place the Jehovist speaks of Jacob building for himself a 'house,' xxxiii.17, as he speaks also of the 'window' of Abimelech's house at Gerar, xxvi.8. He supplies Noah's ark with a 'window,' 'roof,' 'door,' and 'three stories'; and the style of vi.15,16, in which these details are laid down, is so exactly similar to that of E.xxvi,xxvii, &c., where the directions are given for making the Tabernacle, &c.—*comp.* E.xxvii.1—that it can scarcely be doubted that both sets of directions have been recorded by the same author. And, if this is the case, then we have here indications of artistic skill of every kind, which can scarcely have existed in Israel before the age of Solomon, and which in fact was probably never indigenous, but belonged to the Tyrian builders and other artisans engaged in the erection of the Temple.

144. In fact, if the account of the construction of the Tabernacle was not composed by Moses,—and we have shown (as we believe) that the contrary supposition is altogether untenable,—then there seems every reason for supposing *à priori* (*i.e.* before a close examination into the style and contents) that it may or, rather, *must* have been written in the latter part of David's reign or the beginning of Solomon's. For the directions here given are so minute and accurate, that they read almost like the working directions of an architect. If we

dismiss from our minds the traditionary notion, and only consider what is most reasonable and likely to be the truest account of the matter, it would seem that the writer may have had the working-drawings in his hands, either of David's Tabernacle or of Solomon's Temple—that at any rate he had before him the details of one or other of those buildings, and perhaps watched the progress and completion of the work, or may himself have had a hand in designing and planning them, —may, at least, have been consulted about them, as any leading prophet or priest of that age must have been.

145. And, indeed, the fact, which Mr. FERGUSON has lately exhibited so clearly, that the Temple was built exactly on the plan of the Tabernacle described in Exodus, only with all the dimensions doubled, seems to make it more probable that the account in Exodus and the kindred passage in Genesis were written with reference rather to the *Temple* than to David's Tabernacle, and therefore in the early part of Solomon's reign. It may be presumed that David's Tabernacle was not built with so much care and precision. On the traditionary view, indeed, it is inconceivable that David would have dared to build a Tabernacle at all, in order to receive the Ark of God at Jerusalem, when the glorious Mosaic Tabernacle, built by Divine command under most precise directions for the express purpose of receiving the Ark, was still standing, as the Chronicler says, at Gibeon, 1Ch.xvi.39, xxi.29, 2Ch.i.3, and could as easily have been removed to Jerusalem as it had already been moved from Shiloh to Gibeon.*

146. V. Upon the whole, the above observations seem to fix the age of the Jehovist *about the end of David's reign or the*

* Of course, the fact that the Tabernacle at Shiloh had *doors*, 1S.iii.15, that the lamp was allowed regularly to *go out* in it, 1S.iii.3, and that Samuel *slept* in it, and apparently Eli also, 1S.iii.2,3, are sufficient to show that this could *not* have been the 'Mosaic Tabernacle.'

*beginning of Solomon's*—perhaps, within a range of thirty or forty years,—as regards, at least, those portions of his story which have been hitherto considered.

Again, we read the following addressed to Rebekah, xxv.23:—

'Two nations are in thy womb,
And two folks shall be separated from thy bowels;
And folk shall be stronger than folk,
And the elder shall serve the younger.'

This passage, considered as contemporary history, refers plainly to the subjection of the Edomites to Israel in David's days, when the elder (Edom) served the younger (Israel); for—

'David put garrisons in Edom, throughout all Edom put he garrisons; and all they of Edom became David's servants,' 2S.viii.14.

147. And the bitter enmity between Edom and Israel, which resulted from this assumption of sovereignty,—the younger brother taking the right of pre-eminence, which belonged by the order of birth to the older people, and claiming to lord it over the neighbouring tribes,—an enmity which was deepened into a deadly and inveterate hatred, by the defeat of David's forces on one occasion, and the cruel revenge which Joab took in consequence, when he 'went up to bury the slain' of Israel, 1K.xi.16,—is strikingly depicted in xxvii.41:—

'And Esau hated Jacob because of the blessing wherewith his father had blessed him; and Esau said in his heart, The days of mourning for my father are at hand; then will I slay my brother Jacob.'

148. VI. But then, in the very same chapter, we read as follows, in the language addressed by Isaac to Esau, as a substitute for the blessing which he had lost:—

'By thy sword shalt thou live,
And thou shalt serve thy brother;
But *it shall be, when thou shalt have dominion,*
*That thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck.*' xxvii.40.

These words are generally supposed to refer to the time of *Joram*, when, as we read, 2K.viii.20-22—

'Edom revolted from the hand of Judah, and made a king over themselves.'

And, though Joram smote them, it is added—

'Yet Edom revolted from under the hand of Judah unto this day.'

And accordingly many critics have assigned the composition of this section of Genesis to an age subsequent to this event.

But, on closer examination, it will be found that another time will suit very well for this, *viz. the beginning of Solomon's reign*; so that it may have been written—perhaps, a few years later—by the same hand as that which wrote the passage just considered, xxv.23, 'the elder shall serve the younger,' to which reference seems to be made here in the words, 'thou shalt serve thy brother.'

149. It is certain that Edom did remain a 'servant' to his 'younger brother' Israel during the latter part of David's reign, having been thoroughly crushed by Joab's massacre, and held in awe by David's garrisons, as described in 2S.viii.14. But the very fact, that David was obliged to place 'garrisons' in the country, in order to maintain his authority in it, implies that he was not perfectly secure of his position,—that there was a certain stubborn unwillingness on the part of the Edomite people to submit to his yoke. And it is, of course, at variance with the statement in 1K.xi.16, that Joab had 'cut off every male in Edom,' which can only be regarded as a strong exaggeration of the actual fact, and is plainly contradicted by the course of events which we are now about to consider.

150. Perhaps, the people of Edom might have become used in time to the yoke of servitude, but for the return, in the very beginning of Solomon's reign, of their young prince Hadad, who had escaped as a child from Joab's massacre, (in which probably the reigning king, who was perhaps Hadad's father, fell,) as we are told in 1K.xi.21,22. He came back with the evident determination to break off, if possible, this yoke from the neck of his countrymen, and to recover for himself the throne of his ancestors. And this is the account given of his doings, 1K.xi.14–22:—

'And Jehovah raised-up an adversary to Solomon, Hadad the Edomite: from the king's seed was he in Edom. And it came-to-pass, when David was [concerned] with Edom, when Joab captain of the host went-up to bury the slain, and smote every male in Edom,—for six months did Joab dwell there, and all Israel, until they had made an end of every male in Edom,—that Hadad fled, and certain Edomites from among his father's servants with him, to go to Egypt, and Hadad was a little boy. And they started from Midian, and came to Paran, and they took men with them out of Paran, and came to Egypt unto Pharaoh king of Egypt; and he gave him a house, and (said) appointed bread for him, and gave him land. And Hadad found favour in the eyes of Pharaoh greatly; and he gave him a wife, the sister of his wife, the sister of Tahpenes the queen. And the sister of Tahpenes bare to him Genubath his son, and Tahpenes weaned him in the midst of Pharaoh's house; and Genubath was in Pharaoh's house in the midst of Pharaoh's children.

And Hadad heard in Egypt that David lay with his fathers, and that Joab, the captain of the host, was dead; and Hadad said unto Pharaoh, 'Let-me-depart, and go to my own land.' And Pharaoh said to him, 'But what dost thou lack with me that, behold! thou seekest to go unto thine own land?' And he said 'No: but by all means let me go.'

And Elohim raised-up to him an adversary, Rezon the son of Elyadah, who had fled from his lord, Hadadezer king of Zobah. And he gathered to him men, and was captain of a troop at the time of David's smiting them [*i.e.* the Syrians of Zobah]; and they went to Damascus, and dwelt in it, and they reigned in Damascus. And he was an adversary to Israel all the days of Solomon, and together with the evil which Hadad did: and he abhorred Israel, and reigned over Syria.'

151. Here first we observe that the insurrection of Hadad is spoken of as a *punishment* which Jehovah inflicted on Solomon for his idolatries, the sins of his 'old-age,' 1K.xi.1–13. Yet it is plain that Hadad's movement occurred at the very beginning of Solomon's reign, in the very best part of Solomon's life. And so, too, Rezon is described as an adversary of Solomon '*all the days* of Solomon'; where we have a similar inconsistency,—the fact being, apparently, that these two sources of trouble had no connection with Solomon's later doings, though the writer has sought to establish some connection between them.

152. But what success had Hadad in this undertaking? We may judge of this by considering what the above narrative tells us of the doings of Rezon. Now Rezon, who seems to have

begun as a freebooter,—like David himself,—having escaped from his prince, who probably threatened his life,—as David had fled in like manner from Saul *his* lord,—succeeded in obtaining possession of Damascus, and, it is said, 'reigned over Syria.' Yet we had been told in 2S.viii.5,6—

When the Syrians of Damascus came to succour Hadadezer king of Zobah, David slew of the Syrians 22,000 men. And David *put garrisons in Syria of Damascus*, and *the Syrians became servants to David*, and brought gifts.

So that, when David died and Solomon came to the throne, Syria was in exactly the same position as Edom,—unless we suppose that David had already withdrawn his 'garrisons,' of which, however, there is no indication, nor was it likely to have happened during the life-time of Joab. And it seems that Solomon allowed the sovereignty over Syria to be wrested from him without a struggle, so that 'Rezon reigned in Damascus.'

153. Again, the hostile proceedings of Rezon continued, it is said, during 'all the days of Solomon,'—which probably means, not that he was engaged in constant war with Solomon, but that he shook off effectually, at this time, the yoke of Israel, and never again submitted himself or his people to it. We are not, indeed, told that he drove out immediately the 'garrisons,' and gained possession at one stroke of Damascus. But it seems probable that he did. For he seems to have maintained the independence of himself and his band of troopers, till the death of David. And then was the time, for him as well as for Hadad, amidst the troubles of the new reign, when Solomon was yet young, (only *eighteen* at his accession,) and the dreaded captain, Joab, was no more, to strike the decisive blow which he contemplated. Accordingly, we are told, 1K.xi.24—

'They *went* to Damascus, and *dwelt* therein, and *reigned* in Damascus.'

This reads as if the 'garrison' had either retired of its own accord,—it may be, after Joab's death,—or had been withdrawn by the 'peaceful' king or by his new commander-in-chief, Benaiah, without an effort to maintain the position. Nor do we read of a single warlike expedition undertaken by this king or Benaiah.

154. When, therefore, we read of 'the evil which Hadad did,' we may conclude certainly that he met with a success corresponding to that of Rezon. It is plain, indeed, that no vigorous effort could, under the circumstances, have been made to suppress him. We may be sure, therefore, that he did effect his purpose to some considerable extent,—whether to the *full* extent, of liberating his country altogether from the yoke of Israel, does not indeed appear from the narrative. But what was there to prevent his so doing, as Rezon certainly did, and was apparently allowed to do, without the least opposition being made to him? In fact the Vatican MS. of the LXX has the following remarkable variation of 1K.xi. It omits *v.*23–25 altogether, so that no mention whatever is made of Rezon and Syria, and *v.*22 says:—

'And Pharaoh said to Ader (Hadad), 'In what are you badly off with me? And behold! thou seekest to go away to thine own land!' And Ader said to him, 'By all means let me go.' And Ader returned to his own land. This is the mischief which Ader did; and he vexed Israel, and *reigned in the land of Edom.*'

155. Upon the whole, it can scarcely be doubted that Edom did recover its independence under Hadad in the very beginning of Solomon's reign, and 'broke-off from his neck the yoke' of his brother Israel. It should be observed that the language ascribed to Pharaoh implies that he did not advise the measure of Hadad, nor lend him any material help for carrying out his plans. This accords with the fact that, shortly afterwards, he gave one of his own daughters in marriage to Solomon, 1K.iii.1. And this marriage would naturally lead to some amicable arrangement about the affairs of Hadad and Edom. It is quite conceivable that, partly through Solomon's unwillingness for war, and his being engrossed with peaceful duties and occupations of great importance,—partly, through the influence of his Egyptian father-in-law,—he may have acquiesced in Hadad's return to Edom, and resumption of the sovereignty. And so the temper of the king and his advisers,—the resigned spirit of the time,—may be expressed in these words of Isaac's prediction—

'It shall come to pass, when thou shalt have dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck.'

156. And thus also would be explained another phenomenon in connection with this matter, which we observe in the Jehovistic portions of Genesis—*viz.* the *reconciliation* of Esau and Jacob, and the generous conduct of Esau, as described in the narrative of xxxiii. Esau has been deprived of his birthright: he has been wronged, and has felt the wrong acutely: he had a right to feel aggrieved. But he forgets now and forgives it all: he is ready to aid and to defend his brother: he is content to be left in quiet possession of 'the land of Seir, the land of Edom,' xxxii.3,xxxiii.16, whereas Jacob takes possession of the promised land, the land which God gave unto Abraham. May not this shadow forth the peaceful, forgiving, course of conduct, which the king and his advisers may have hoped for in Solomon's days from their Edomite brother? Nor, in fact, is there any indication of any *active hostility* between Hadad and Solomon: only the Edomites seem to have broken off the yoke of Israel.

157. It remains now that we explain the statements in 2K.viii.20–22, that Edom revolted in the days of *Joram*, and the previous remark, 1K.xxii.47, that in the time of *Jehoshaphat*, 'there was no king in Edom, a deputy was king.'

Now the very fact, that this circumstance, in the days of Jehoshaphat, is mentioned at all as *remarkable*, suggests of itself the probability that *not long before* there *was* a king in Edom, and that something had recently occurred to produce a change in this respect. If, all along from the days of David's conquest, for 120 years, there had been 'no king' in Edom, and if this state of things had continued for thirty years more during the reign of Jehoshaphat, it would be strange, to say the least, that such a circumstance should be here particularly noticed. Why was it more remarkable in Jehoshaphat's days than in Solomon's, Rehoboam's, Abijah's, or Asa's? And what is the meaning of the statement in 2K.iii.9 that the '*king of*

*Edom*' joined his forces with those of the king of Judah (Jehoshaphat) and the king of Israel (Jehoram) against the king of Moab? Was this an *independent* 'king of Edom,' or not?

158. In 2Ch.xx we are told that in the days of king Jehoshaphat a great multitude came up against him, consisting of the children of Ammon, and Moab, and *Mount Seir, i.e.* Edom, *v.*22,23. And, when the king in his distress sought help from Jehovah, a prophet assured him of a wonderful deliverance. Accordingly, the Chronicler informs us,—

'And when Judah came towards the watch-tower in the wilderness, they looked unto the multitude, and behold! they were dead bodies fallen to the earth, and none escaped,' 2Ch.xx.22–24.

'Jehovah set ambushments against the children of Ammon, Moab, and Mount Seir, which were come against Judah, and they were smitten. For the children of Ammon and Moab stood up against the inhabitants of Mount Seir, utterly to slay and destroy them. And when they had made an end of the inhabitants of Seir, every one helped to destroy another, &c.' 2Ch.xx.22-29.

159. The whole story is a very strange one, and it is impossible to receive it as literally true. Yet some fact may lie at the base of it. And it is particularly to be noticed that this story occupies exactly the same position in the Chronicles that the passage just quoted—'there was then no king in Edom &c.'—does in the Kings; that is to say, it is inserted between the account of the war with Syria, in which Jehoshaphat took part with Ahab, and that of Jehoshaphat's intercourse and shipping transactions with Ahab's son, Ahaziah. It might be regarded then as an *amplification* of the short note of the writer in Kings, either from the Chronicler's point of view, or from the materials at his disposal. And, whatever may be thought of the historical character of this narrative, it may, perhaps, be inferred that an attack was made on Judah by Moab, Ammon and Edom, in Jehoshaphat's days, so that Edom, whether under a king or not, *was not at that time under Jehoshaphat's rule.*

160. It is possible that in consequence of some great disaster, which befel the invaders on this occasion,—perhaps, as the Chronicler's story would imply, from some fierce dissension among themselves,—Jehoshaphat was enabled to make Edom

tributary again, and appoint some one, probably an Edomite, to rule as his 'deputy.' And this, the *titular* king, may be the 'king of Edom' mentioned in 2K.iii,9, as joining his forces shortly afterwards with those of Jehoshaphat and Jehoram against the Moabites. Then, after Jehoshaphat's death, the Edomites under this or another king, may have finally revolted in the days of Joram, 2K.viii.20.

161. Thus all the difficulties of this history may be sufficiently cleared. And the result remains that the Jehovistic section, xxvii.40, and the series of passages connected with it, *viz.* those in which reference is made to Esau's anger, *e.g.* xxxii.3-21, xxxiii.1-17, xxxv.1-47, *cannot have been written till after David's death*, but were very probably composed in the very beginning of the reign of SOLOMON, when Edom had long been serving his brother, and had only just thrown off the yoke.

162. VII. Again, we observe that the Jehovist lays almost as great a stress on *Beersheba* as the Elohist does on *Hebron*. Both Abraham and Isaac dig a well at Beersheba, xxi.30, xxvi.32, and acquire a right of possession in respect of it,—Abraham by a kind of purchase, xxi.28–30, and each in connection with a solemn covenant made with the Philistine king, xxi.27,32,xxvi.28–31. Whereas according to the Elohist each of the three patriarchs lived solely at Hebron,—at least, after Abraham's acquisition of property there,—and the Jehovist also in various places takes account of their having lived there at some time in their lives, xiii.18,xxiv.67,xxxvii.14,—yet with the latter the habitual place of residence of Abraham and Isaac is Beersheba, xxii.19,xxvi.23, *comp.*xxviii.10; and he makes Jacob go thither before he went down to Egypt, and 'offer sacrifices unto the Elohim of his father Isaac,' xlvi.1.

163. This seems to point to the fact that in the days of David and Solomon the territory of the land of Canaan, claimed by Israel, was held to extend 'from Dan to Beersheba.' The phrase is first used in Ju.xx.1,1S.iii.20, narratives written,

no doubt, in this age; and it is repeated in 2S.iii.10,xvii.11, xxiv.2,15, 1K.iv.25, all passages referring to the time of David and Solomon; but it is used nowhere else in the Bible except once by the later Chronicler, 2Ch.xxx.5. In fact, the phrase would seem to have belonged only to the time of the united kingdom, and would cease to be significant after the separation of the Ten Tribes. Beersheba, indeed, was still the southern limit of Judah, and Dan the northern limit of Israel; but the people could no longer be spoken of as one nation under one king, 'from Dan to Beersheba,'—at least, not till after the captivity of the Ten Tribes, when the kings of Judah might be spoken of as ruling again over the whole land, as in 2Ch.xxx.5.

164. As early, however, as the time of Samuel, it would seem, Beersheba was claimed for Israel; since we are told that—

'When Samuel was old, he made his sons judges over Israel . . . judges in *Beersheba*,' 1S.viii.1,2.

Here then, *within* (it would seem) the territory of the small Philistine state of Gerar, xxi.25,xxvi.15,18, the Israelites asserted their right of possession in virtue of some ancient relations between their fathers and the bygone kings of Gerar. And, as we never find that David made war on Gerar, which is mentioned by the Chronicler as existing as a separate state down as late as the days of Asa, 2Ch.xiv.13,14, it is possible that he may have had peaceful relations with the king of Gerar, as he had with Achish king of Gath, 1S.xxvii.1–7, (called 'Abimelech' in the Title of Ps.xxxiv); and the stories of the friendly intercourse of Abraham and Isaac with *Abimelech* may even foreshadow these very relations.

But the great stress laid by the Jehovist on Beersheba seems to point, like the other indications which we have had before us, to the time of David and Solomon as the age of their composition; and, perhaps, the *earliest* passages which mention Beersheba, xxi.14,32, may be due to the latter days of Saul, and the others to the reigns of David and Solomon.

# CHAPTER XI.

## THE AGE OF THE JEHOVIST (CONTINUED).

165. VIII. We may observe further that the Jehovist dwells even more strongly than the Elohist upon the sanctity of *Bethel*; and suppose (294) that he designed to cancel the Elohistic passage referring to Bethel, xxxv.9–15, and replace it by his own, xxviii.10–22. But, however this may be, the Jehovistic passage is by far the most elaborate and impressive of the two: and, what is especially to be noticed, the idea of the 'El of Beth-El'—the protecting 'God of Jacob,' the 'Shepherd and Stone of Israel'—runs like a kind of thread through many following sections of the Jehovist, *e.g.* xxxi, xxxii, xlviii.15,16, xlix.24.

166. Now it seems very unlikely that so much would be said about the sanctity of Bethel *after* the separation of the two kingdoms, when Jeroboam had set up his idolatrous worship there. In Samuel's time, no doubt, it was a famous high place, 1S.vii.16, x.3, as it had been in the time of the Judges, xx.18, 26,31, xxi.2; and so it probably continued down to the days of Rehoboam. And this will account for Jeroboam's selecting it not only as a place for one of his calves, but as the site of the *annual festival*, which he ordained 'like to the Feast that is in Judah,' 1K.xii.32.

167. At any rate, the passage before us would hardly have been written at so late a time as this—nor even, as we may suppose, *after* the building of Solomon's Temple, which was meant to attract the people to Jerusalem, and gradually get

rid of these high-places, which existed throughout the land. The experiment, indeed, did not succeed: the high-places were not removed, and Solomon himself built more of them; and so the people still, till the time of Hezekiah and afterwards, worshipped at them by preference. It seems unlikely, however, that this commendation of Bethel should have been written *after* the building of the Temple, or even after Solomon had determined to build it. Only in his very first years, when he himself still 'sacrificed and burnt incense in the high-places,' 1K.iii.3, can we suppose that it may have been written, if written in Solomon's days. And this is just the very time at which, from a consideration of the prediction about Edom, we have shown that it may have been written.

168. IX. But we observe also that in xxviii.22, Jacob is made to say—

'This stone which I have set as a pillar, shall be the House of Elohim: and, *of all which Thou shalt give me, I will surely give the tithe unto Thee.*'

Here, then, is the first instance of a *tithe*-system being introduced for the support of the priesthood. The idea, indeed, of taking a *tenth* seems to have been a familiar one in the age of Solomon. Thus, in a passage written probably by a writer of that time, we have Samuel represented as warning the Israelites about the king whom they so eagerly demanded,—the idea being probably drawn from the actual example of Solomon,—

'He will take the tithe of your seed and of your vineyards. . . . He will take the tithe of your sheep.' 1S.viii.15,17.

Hardly, however, *before* the setting-up of David's Tabernacle in Jerusalem could the notion have been entertained of requiring a tenth from all Israel—after the example of their great forefather, Jacob—for the support of the priesthood.

169. Yet hardly, perhaps, in the first years of the Tabernacle would this demand be made. But the idea of making it might very well be entertained towards the middle of David's reign or

the beginning of Solomon's. And it is noticeable that Jacob does not say that he will bring the tithes *to this place*, Bethel—but only that he will give them to Jehovah. And, in point of fact, when he does go-up to Bethel, according to the account of this writer, to fulfil his vow there, xxxv.1–7, there is not the least sign of his bringing the tithe of all his substance, and offering it there to Jehovah: he merely 'builds an altar,' and 'calls the place El-Beth-El,' *v.*7. We may suppose, then, that this writer did not *mean*, by the expression put into Jacob's mouth in xxviii.22, that he bound himself to bring these tithes to *Bethel* exclusively. And the lesson intended to be taught by his example may have been generally this, that it was the duty of every pious Israelite, in return for the protection and blessing extended to him by Jehovah, to do what Jacob did, and give the tenth of all he had to the service of Jehovah,—that is, to the support of the priesthood *somewhere*,—as Elkanah carried up his three bullocks, and his offering of flour and wine, for the priests at *Shiloh*. In still later days, the idea was carried out still farther, and a direct tithe demanded for the priests who ministered at the Temple in Jerusalem.

170. X. So, too, the Jehovist carries out more fully the hint, as it were, of the Elohist, who sets Ephraim before Manasseh; and he expands the idea into a direct prediction put into the mouth of the dying patriach, Jacob, xlviii.19, where, when Joseph tells him that Manasseh is the firstborn, Jacob is made to say:—

> 'I know it, my son, I know it;
> He too shall become a people, and he too shall be great;
> And yet his younger brother shall be greater than he,
> And his seed shall be the fulness of nations.'

As Ephraim had been, as we have seen (103–105), from the days of Jephthah downwards, the most populous and powerful tribe in the north of Canaan, the above might have been written about him by the Jehovist, if he lived at any time between the

days of Samuel and those of Rehoboam,—but scarcely *after* the separation of the two kingdoms, at least if the writer belonged to the kingdom of Judah. Such a writer naturally, after that event, would have had little inclination to expatiate upon the greatness of Ephraim over Manasseh, or upon the populous numbers of Ephraim itself. He would not have cared to make the patriarch say of them—

> Let my name be named upon them,
> And the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac;
> 'And let them swarm as fishes in the midst of the earth,' *v.*16.

Still less would he have written—

'And he blessed them that day, saying, By thee shall Israel bless, saying, Elohim make thee as Ephraim and as Manasseh!' *v.*20.

171. But at any time after the first 7½ years of David's reign, when Ephraim had received him as king, 2S.v.1–5, till the latter part of Solomon's reign, when probably the discontents began, 1K.xi.26, which broke out into rebellion in the time of his son, any writer attached to the house of David might have used such language of Ephraim,—might even have used it *politically*, with a view to secure the favour of this powerful tribe, even as David himself wrote, as we believe, in Ps.lx.7,—

'Ephraim is the stength of my head: Judah is my lawgiver.'

These words, then, might very well have been written, as other indications seem to imply, *in the early years of Solomon.*

172. XI. The Jehovist also lays stress on the fact that Jacob had bought a piece of land at *Shechem*, xxxiii.19, 'from the hand of the sons of Hamor,' as Abraham, according to the Elohist, had bought the land at Hebron from the sons of Heth. But he is not content with this: he makes also the sons of Israel take forcible possession of Shechem, in retaliation for the wrong done to their sister Dinah, xxxiv.27–29. And Jacob, though he blames their violence, xxxiv.30, yet is represented, apparently, as acquiescing in the results of their act, and claiming possession

of the place for himself; since he is made to say on his deathbed to Joseph, xlviii.22—

'And I give thee one portion (שְׁכֶם, *shĕchem*, lit. 'shoulder') over-and-above thy brethren, which I took from the hand of the Amorite with my sword and with my bow.'

And accordingly Joseph's bones, which he desires may be carried up to Canaan, l.25, were buried on this spot according to Jo.xxiv.32.*

173. This also prevents our supposing that the Jehovist wrote after the separation of the Ten Tribes. For Shechem was long the principal place among the northern tribes. In Jo.xxiv, Joshua assembles 'all the tribes of Israel to Shechem,' and there makes his last address to them, and renews the covenant between them and God, *v.*14–25, and sets up a stone under an oak as a witness of this, *v.*26,27. We read again in Ju.ix.6 of this pillar, by which under the oak, Abimelech was made king by the men of Shechem. To Shechem all Israel came in like manner to make Rehoboam king, 1K.xii.1, where his violent language displeased them, and led to the rupture of the kingdom. After this, Jeroboam rebuilt Shechem, and made it his royal residence, *v.*25; and then very soon it disappears from the history, having been replaced first by Tirzah, xv.33, and then by Samaria, xvi.24.

It seems, then, impossible to suppose that these passages, which attach so much importance to Shechem, should have been

* There is a well-known series of contradictions to the data of Genesis in the words attributed to Stephen in Acts vii.15,16. Whereas in Genesis we are told that Jacob was buried at *Hebron*, in the burying-place which Abraham bought of the *sons of Heth*, l.13, and that *Jacob* bought a piece of land at Shechem, xxxiii.19, from Hamor the *father* of Shechem, (apparently meant to be the same which he gives to Joseph on his deathbed, xlviii.22, though he there speaks of it as a *conquest*, in which *Joseph's* bones were buried, Jo.xxiv.32,)—yet, according to Stephen, Jacob was buried at *Shechem*, in the sepulchre which *Abraham* bought of the *sons of Hamor*, who is spoken of apparently as the *son* of Shechem, παρὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἐμμὸρ τοῦ Συχέμ, or rather he says 'Jacob and our fathers,' *i.e.* Jacob and his twelve sons, were 'carried over into Sychem &c.'

written after the death of Solomon. But they are very intelligible, if written *in the days of David or Solomon*,—especially if written by a *man of Ephraim*.

174. XII. For the very great length at which this writer gives the history of *Joseph*, and the very generous and influential part, which he evidently intends to assign to Joseph himself in that history,—as well as the strong expressions of blessing pronounced, as we have just seen, on Ephraim and Manasseh, and the remarkable commendations of Joseph in xlix.22–26, to which we shall draw attention presently,—seem to make it very probable that this writer must have been a man of the tribe of Ephraim. Of course, either in the latter part of David's reign or the early part of Solomon's, there would be no reason why an Ephraimite should not be strongly attached to the House of David, whatever might be the case after the rupture under Rehoboam.

175. But it also to be observed that *Judah* fills a very conspicuous place in this part of the story, as the adviser of his brethren, xxxvii.26,27, with the view of saving Joseph's life, (since Joseph had been left in the pit to perish by his brothers, who were ignorant of Reuben's intention to deliver him,)—again, as the influential pleader with his father, xliii.3–14,—once more, as the tender-hearted son and brother, xliv.18–34, who cannot bear to see his father's face without bringing back his darling Benjamin, and who will become himself a slave that the boy may be sent home. Thus *Judah* is relieved from almost all blame in the matter: Reuben, as firstborn, takes the initiative twice in the same direction, xxxvii.21,22,29,30, xlii.37,38; but *his* efforts fail, while Judah's are attended with success. Yet *Joseph* it is who saves the lives of his father and brethren, xlvii.12, l.21.

The whole, in short, is very intelligible, on the supposition that the author was *an Ephramite*, but one who was *closely attached to the royal House of Judah*, and writing, *either*

*from the middle of David's reign to the beginning of Solomon's.*

176. XIII. Again, the strange account of the incestuous intercourse between Lot and his daughters in xix.30–38 seems designed to fix the stain of base and abominable origin upon the Moabites and Ammonites, whose *kinship* with Israel could not be denied, but between whom and Israel a bitter and implacable hatred existed in David's time. Even in that of Saul we read how—

'Nahash the Ammonite came up and encamped against Jabesh-Gilead; and all the men of Jabesh said unto Nahash, Make a covenant with us and we will serve thee. And Nahash the Ammonite said, On this condition will I make a covenant with you, that I may thrust out your right eyes, and *lay it for a reproach upon all Israel.*' 1S.xi.1,2.

And Saul's great victory over the Ammonites, we are told, determined the people of Israel to claim him as king, *v.*11–15.

177. Nahash, indeed, seems to have shown some special kindness to David, 2S.x.2,—probably, in the time of his persecution by Saul, and out of hostility to Saul and Israel. But, when David himself, after the death of Nahash, desired to be on friendly terms with his son Hanun, the latter contemptuously rejected David's overtures, and treated his ambassadors with gross insult. Thus we read, 2S.x.4—

'Hanun took David's servants, and shaved off the one half of their beards, and cut off their garments in the middle, even to their buttocks, and sent them away.'

And then, we are told, *v.*6,—

'When the children of Ammon saw that they *stank* before David, the children of Ammon sent and hired the Syrians of Bethrehob and the Syrians of Zobah, &c.'

178. A fierce war ensued, which seems to have lasted several years, till at last, after David's sin with Bathsheba had occurred and been exposed, 2S.xii.1–23, Jacob sends for David to complete the capture of Rabbah, the Ammonite capital; and the treatment, to which David subjected the citizens and the

people generally, shows sufficiently the envenomed spitefulness, with which he and 'all Israel' regarded the Ammonites, *v.*31 :—

'And he brought forth the people that were therein, and put them under saws, and under harrows of iron, and under axes of iron, and made them pass through the brickkiln; and thus did he unto all the cities of the children of Ammon.'

We are not told what was the special offence of the people of Moab: but the feeling against them in David's days must have been just as intense and bitter, since we read, 2S.viii.2—

'And he smote Moab, and measured them with a line, casting them down to the ground; even with two lines measured he to put to death, and with one full line to keep alive.'

179. Yet again, some ten years afterwards, we find David, in the time of his great distress during Absalom's rebellion, receiving great kindness from 'Shobi the son of Nahash of Rabbah of the children of Ammon,' 2S.xvii.27, who must either have been a wealthy private individual, or, perhaps, may have been appointed under David regent of the people of Ammon. Shortly after this also Solomon must have been married to 'Naamah an Ammonitess,' 1K.xiv.21,31, who, according to the LXX, 1K.xii.24, was 'daughter of Hanun, son of Nahash, king of the children of Ammon'—which supports my view of Ps.xlv (II.376). The contumelious depreciation of the Ammonites, by this account of their incestuous origin, would hardly have been written *after* the time at which an Ammonitess became the mother of the kings of Judah, in the latter part of David's reign.

180. XIV. In xix.4–8 we have an account of the uncleanness of the people of Sodom, to which immediately, as also generally to the vicious habits of the people of Sodom and Gomorrah, xviii.20, the destruction of these cities is ascribed; and, though nothing is said here either about the sins or the destruction, xviii.20,xix.24, of the other cities, Admah and Zeboim, yet these also, it seems, were involved in the catastrophe, Hos.xi.8. Still the four cities are named together in x.19,xiv.8; and therefore

the mention of Zoar, as the only place left to which Lot could fly, xix.20–22, implies the destruction of all the others. The Elohist simply mentions the fact of the overthrow of the 'cities of the plain,' xix.29, as a mere matter of history, without any hint that it was occasioned by the guilt of their inhabitants. And the manner in which the Elohist refers to the occurrence, as an event well-known to his readers, might almost suggest that it had happened in comparatively recent times; so that the tradition about the nature and extent of the catastrophe, whatever it really was, was still rife among the people.

181. Since subterranean agency is still very active in these regions, it is very probable that, by some sinking of the ground in ancient days, four or more towns such as these were overwhelmed in the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea. But the recent explorations of travellers have shown that there are no signs whatever of *volcanic eruption*, which might be supposed to explain the statement in xix.24, that—

'Jehovah rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah fire and brimstone from Jehovah out of heaven.'

The writer in G.x.19, however, seems to speak of those cities or their ruins as *still existing in his own time*,—

'the border of the Canaanites was from Sidon, as thou goest to Gerar, unto Gaza, as thou goest unto Sodom and Gomorrah and Admah and Zeboim, even unto Lasha.'

These would be strange words to have been used either by Moses or, as we suppose, by the Jehovist, in order to mark the boundary of a country, if these cities had altogether disappeared, buried, as is commonly supposed, beneath the waves of the Dead Sea. Probably, their sites were still marked in the days when he wrote by extensive ruins. And upon the fact of their destruction in this way, handed down by tradition, exhibited by these remains, and supported by the barren nature of the scene and of the lake itself with its sluggish waters, hushed, as it were, into a deathlike silence, the writer has founded his story of the wicked cities, and their overthrow.

182. The following account of the Dead Sea is abridged from Dean STANLEY'S *Sinai and Palestine*, *p.*290–294.

A great mass of legend and exaggeration, partly the effect, partly the cause, of the old belief, that the cities were buried under the Dead Sea, has been gradually removed in recent years. The glittering surface of the lake, with the thin mist of its own evaporations floating over its surface, will now no more be taken for a gloomy sea, sending forth sulphurous exhalations. The birds, which pass over it without injury, have long ago destroyed the belief, that no living creature could survive the baneful atmosphere which hung upon its waters. Its basin is a steaming cauldron—a bowl, as it has been well described, which, from the peculiar temperature and deep cavity in which it is situated, can never be filled to overflowing. The river Jordan, itself exposed to the same influences, is not copious enough to furnish a supply equal to the demand made by the rapid evaporation.

It is clear that the cavity of the Dead Sea belongs to the same general conformation of country that produced both the valley of the Jordan and the Arabah (between the Dead Sea and the Red Sea), and that, therefore, its formation must be traced to a period long before historical times. A convulsion of such a magnitude as not only to produce a new lake, but to *depress* the valley of the Jordan many hundred feet below the level of the Mediterranean, and *elevate* the valley of the Arabah considerably above that level, must have shattered Palestine to its centre, and left upon the historical traditions of the time an indelible impression, of which, it is needless to say, not a trace is actually to be found. It seems to be concluded as most probable that the whole valley, from the base of Hermon to the Red Sea, was once an arm of the Indian Ocean, which has gradually subsided, leaving the three lakes in its bed with their connecting river.

But, in connection with the sacred history, its excessive saltness is even more remarkable than its deep depression. To the sacred writers it was the Salt Sea, and nothing more. They exhibit hardly a trace of the exaggerations of later times. And so it is in fact. It is not *gloom*, but *desolation*, which is the prevailing characteristic of the Sea of Death. Gradually, within the last mile of the Dead Sea, the verdure of the Jordan dies away, and the river melts into its grave in a tame and sluggish stream, still, however, of sufficient force to carry its brown waters far into the bright green sea. Along the desert shore, the white coast of salt indicates the cause of sterility. Thus the few living creatures, which the Jordan washes down with the waters of the Sea, are destroyed. Hence arises the unnatural buoyancy and the intolerable nausea to taste and touch, which raise to the highest pitch the contrast between its clear bitter waves and the soft fresh turbid stream of its parent river. Strewn along its desolate margin, lie the most striking memorials of the last conflict of life and death—trunks and branches of trees, torn down from the thickets of the river-jungle by the violence of the Jordan, thrust out into the sea, and thrown up again by its waves, dead and barren as itself. A deep haze, that which to earlier ages gave the appearance of the 'smoke going up for ever and ever,' veils its southern extremity, and almost gives it the

dim horizon of a real sea. At its south-western corner rises the mountain of rock-salt (Usdum); and on its sides stand out the columnar fragment or fragments, doubtless presenting the same appearance as that which Josephus describes as the pillar of Lot's wife, existing in his own day, and seen by himself.

183. The idea of Lot's wife having been turned into a pillar of salt, xix.26, originated, no doubt, in the fact mentioned above by Dean STANLEY, that a mass of salt, in the form of a pillar, was to be seen in the writer's time,—which JOSEPHUS says he saw in *his* time, and which is probably that which may be still seen in our own days, in the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea. The following is the account of it given by Lieut. LYNCH, who commanded the American expedition for the exploration of the Dead Sea in 1847–8. The party, he says, had approached the base of the salt mountain of Usdum, at the southern extremity of the lake, and he continues :—

With regard to this part, therefore, which most probably covers the guilty cities—

'We are the first
That ever burst
Into this silent sea.'

At nine, the water shoaling, we hauled more off shore. Soon after, to our astonishment, we saw on the eastern side of Usdum, a lofty, round, pillar, standing apparently detached from the general mass, at the head of a deep, narrow, and abrupt chasm. We immediately pulled in for the shore, and Dr. Anderson and I went up and examined it. We found the pillar to be of solid salt, capped with carbonate of lime, cylindrical in front and pyramidal behind. The upper or rounded part is about forty feet high, resting on a kind of oval pedestal, from forty to sixty feet above the level of the Sea. It slightly decreases in size upwards, crumbles at the top, and is one entire mass of crystallisation. The peculiar shape is, doubtless, attributable to the action of the winter rains. A similar pillar is mentioned by Josephus, who expresses his belief of its being the identical one, into which Lot's wife was transformed. His words are, 'But Lot's wife, continually turning back to view the city as she wen from it, and being too nicely inquisitive as to what would become of it, was changed into a pillar of salt, for I have seen it, and it remains at this day.'

184. But, while the cavity of the Dead Sea *generally* is probably due to a period long antecedent to historical times, it is possible that a later movement, the accounts of which were still remembered traditionally in Samuel's time, may have

effected the destruction of the 'cities of the plain.' Thus KALISCH writes, *Gen.p.*416, &c.

The Dead Sea may be divided into two very dissimilar parts; the northern part is incomparably deeper than the southern part; for while the former reaches to a depth of about 1,200 feet, that of the latter does not exceed eighteen feet, and is at the extremity so shallow as not to be navigated by boats. It is, therefore, evident that the bottom of the Dead Sea consists of two different plains, a depressed and more elevated one. It is probable that this southern plateau was formed by the events to which our text refers, that the lake originally consisted of the northern part only, and that the same catastrophe, which produced the depression of the southern plain, destroyed the four cities. For in a former passage it is stated that the Dead Sea was originally the 'vale of Siddim.' It was, therefore, the notion of the Biblical author that the valley was submerged and became sea.

This change was, apparently, effected in a violent manner by volcanic action. Palestine has been frequently subject to fearful convulsions even in historical times—witness the terrible earthquake in the reign of Uzziah, Amos i.1, Zech.xiv.5. At the NE. of the Dead Sea is the Jebel Musa, consisting entirely of black bituminous limestone, and burning like coal. There are the hot springs of Tiberias, Cadara, and Callirrhoe. The whole valley of the Jordan exhibits volcanic traces: at the western side the limestone is intersected by numerous dykes and seams of basalt, with deep fissures and saline sulphurous springs. Several lines of earthquakes have been traced. That of 1759 buried twenty thousand persons in the valley of Baalbec; and for three months the inhabitants of Lebanon were afraid to enter their houses, and lived in huts. It is, therefore, more than probable that a volcanic eruption [? action] effected the depression of the then fertile vale of Siddim; and the bitumen-pits, with which it abounded, sufficiently betray the character of the region. Thus the waters of the lake covered this submerged plain.

Strabo had a correct notion of the volcanic nature of the valley of the Dead Sea. He observes that the asphalte rises mostly from the middle of the lake, because the source of the fire is the centre. He mentions rugged rocks near Masada, bearing marks of fire. He speaks of fissures in many places, of a soil like ashes, of pitch falling in drops from the rocks, of rivers boiling up and emitting a fetid odour to a great distance, and of dwellings in every direction overthrown. And he then alludes to the tradition of the natives, that formerly thirteen cities, with the capital Sodom, flourished in these parts—that, however, shocks of earthquakes, eruptions of flames, and hot-springs, containing asphalte and sulphur, caused the lake to burst its bounds—that the rocks took fire, and some cities were swallowed up, while others were deserted by such of the inhabitants as were able to escape.

185. The indications, which we have observed above, of the comparatively recent occurrence of this catastrophe tend to fix

the ages of the Elohist and Jehovist at a somewhat early period in the history of Israel,—yet not *too* early. For the Second Jehovist refers to the four cities and the vale of Siddim, as still existing in Abram's time; and he speaks also of 'Salem,' that is, Jerusalem, xiv.18, and lived, therefore, we must suppose, not earlier than David's time, when the stronghold of Zion was taken from the Jebusites, 2S.v.6-9, and when probably the name 'Jerusalem' for the first time took the place of the old name 'Jebus.'

186. And this appears to be confirmed by another consideration. In Ju.xix we have the story of the wickedness of the men of Gibeah, which (except in the nature of the final catastrophe) is precisely similar in many of its details to that recorded in G.xix, and brought civil war and fearful bloodshed upon the tribes of Israel. Great allowance must be made, of course, for exaggeration in the numbers stated to have been killed in the different conflicts. But there seems to have been real matter of fact at the foundation of most of the stories in the Book of Judges, which, considered as an historical document, is probably more trustworthy than the Pentateuch or Book of Joshua. As the event, which lies at the ground of the story of Gibeah, may have occurred not very long before the time of Samuel, the recollections of it and its painful consequences may have been maintained in his days, and in those of the generation after him. In composing, then, the story of Sodom and Gomorrah, the Jehovistic writer may have had before his eyes this very affair at Gibeah,—the story of which, indeed, the Prophet Hosea, ix.9, x.9, brings into close connection with that of the cities of the plain; and he may have sought to exhibit in this way the horrible character of the abominable vice of sodomy, to threaten it with God's direst vengeance, and stamp it with utter infamy. And this would imply that he lived at an early age, when the remembrance of this atrocious wickedness of the men of Gibeah had not yet been lost in Israel.

187. XV. Once more, the derivation of the name 'Mahanaim' in xxxii.2 has probably a significance for us in connection with the fact, that this place only appears conspicuously in the history on *two* occasions, and each time *in the days of David.*

Thus, first, in the very beginning of David's reign, we read in 2S.ii.8,9, that, after the death of Saul,—

'Abner the son of Ner, captain of Saul's host, took Ishbosheth the son of Saul, and brought him over to *Mahanaim*, and made him king over Gilead, and over the Ashurites, and over Jezreel, and over Ephraim, and over Benjamin, and over all Israel.'

And, again, when David fled from Jerusalem before Absalom, we are told that he took refuge in *Mahanaim*, 2S.xvii.24,27, 1K.ii.8; and there he also appears to have reigned, 2S.xix.32, until his restoration to Jerusalem.

After this, Mahanaim is only once mentioned, as one of the places where Solomon's officers were stationed, 1K.iv.14; and so it disappears altogether from the Scripture narrative.

It is possible, therefore, that xxxii.1,2, may have been written *in the early part of David's reign*, when Mahanaim had attracted special attention. And, on the other hand, it is *not* probable that it was composed *after* the days of David and Solomon, when it ceased to be a place of note, and belonged, in fact, no longer to Judah.

# CHAPTER XII.

## JACOB'S BLESSING ON JUDAH.

188. We come now to the consideration of a very important section of the Jehovistic writer, which contains the Blessing of Jacob upon his sons, and will furnish us with some decisive signs of time, if regarded, like the other predictions,—on the relations of Edom and Israel, Ephraim and Manasseh,—as a *vaticinium ex evento*, a piece of historical narrative, referring to facts contemporary with the writer. With respect to most of the tribes, indeed, so little is here said, and so little is known to us about them from other sources, that we cannot expect to obtain, from a consideration of the words addressed to each of them, any distinct indications of time. But in the case of *three* tribes, Levi, Judah, and Joseph, and slightly, perhaps, in that of one or two others, we do find such signs. We shall first consider at length the 'blessings' pronounced on these three tribes, beginning with that on Judah, and add a few remarks upon the others and on the Blessing generally.

189. The Blessing on Judah, xlix.8–12.

Judah, thou! thy brethren shall praise thee;
Thy hand is on the neck of thy foes;
Thy father's sons shall bow to thee.
A lion's whelp is Judah,
Ravaging the young of the suckling-ewes;*

* We adopt the suggestion of Land, *Disp. de Carm. Jacob. p.*50, that this line should be read as follows, מִטֶּרֶף בְּנִי עָלוֹת; for עָלוֹת used alone in this sense see Ps.lxxviii.71, Is.xl.11, and *comp.* G.xxxiii.13, 1S.vi.7,10.

He stooped, he couched as a lion,
And as a lioness,—who shall rouse him?
The staff shall not depart from Judah,
Nor the rod from between his feet,
Until he come to Shiloh,—(KURTZ, 'Until he come to rest,')
And to him be the obedience of the peoples.
Binding to the vine his ass-colt,
And to the vine-branch the young of his she-ass,—
He shall wash with wine his vesture,
And with the blood of grapes his dress,—
Dark in the eyes with wine,
And white in the teeth with milk.

There can scarcely be a doubt that the above passage refers to the position of the tribe of Judah in David's reign. It contains plain references to the martial spirit and prowess of David,—to the flourishing state of Judah under his rule,—to the fact that his struggles still continued either within or without his kingdom,—and it expresses the confidence which the writer felt that he would ultimately triumph over all opposition. Under Solomon, indeed, the *splendour* of the kingdom of Judah was greatest. But Solomon was a peaceful king, and in respect of power he fell short of his father, and was unable, as we have seen (148–161), to maintain his hold on Syria and Edom, which had been subdued by David.

190. *Before* David's time the tribe of Judah was not distinguished. It is not even named in the Song of Deborah, Ju.v, having been probably from its position especially exposed to the inroads of the *Philistines*, and having taken no part in Barak's great victory, in which the northern tribes were chiefly concerned. We read of the Ammonites attacking Judah, Ju.x.9; and in Ju.xv.10–13, we find the 'men of Judah' ignobly recognising the lordship of the Philistines, and binding Samson to deliver him into their hands. In xx.18–21, when all Israel was gathered 'from Dan to Beersheba' to punish the Benjamites, Judah was sent out first against Benjamin, and was utterly routed. When Saul numbered his troops in Bezek, the men of

Judah are reckoned as *one in ten* of the men of Israel, 1S.xi.8, and one in *twenty* at Telaim, 1S.xv.4. And so we come to the time of David, when his brethren 'bowed' to Judah.

191. But the 'Blessing' here addressed to Judah has a trumpet-sound of war in it as well as a full tone of royalty.

> 'Thy hand is on the neck of thy foes;
> A lion's whelp is Judah,
> Ravaging the young of the suckling-ewes;
> He stooped, he couched as a lion,
> And as a lioness,—who shall rouse him?'

Such language may very well have been used to describe David's exploits, as recorded in 2.S.v,viii, where we are told how David 'took the stronghold of Zion from the Jebusites,' *v.*7, and 'went on and grew great,' *v.*10, and 'smote the Philistines at Baal-Perazim,' *v.*20, and again 'from Geba until thou come to Gezer,' *v.*25, and 'smote them again and subdued them,' viii.1, and 'smote Moab,'—

'and measured them with a line, casting them down to the ground, even with two lines measured he to put to death, and with one full line to keep alive,' *v.*2,—

and 'smote also Hadadezer king of Zobah,' *v.*3, and when the Syrians of Damascus came to succour him, slew of the Syrians also 22,000 men,' and—

'put garrisons in Edom, and all they of Edom became David's servants,' *v.*14—

with other such conquests.

192. We lay it down then as certain that the words of 'Jacob's Blessing' now before us were written with reference to David's time—and at a period, as we have said, when he was still exposed to danger, or harassed by difficulties, from within or from without. The expression, 'the obedience of the *peoples*,' may be understood as applying only to the tribes of Israel, *comp.* *v.*16, xxviii.3; or it may be understood of the subjugation of the nations round-about, as Moab and Edom; and the distinct reference to David's victories seems to make the last the most probable supposition. He was to go on, 'conquering

and to conquer,' until his hand should be on the neck of every foe,—

> 'Until he come to Shiloh,
> And to him be the obedience of the peoples.'

Thus we can fix the date of the composition, of this section with tolerable precision, as, at all events, *after* B.C.1046, the *tenth* year of David's reign.

193. But what is the exact meaning of the clause just quoted, 'Until he come to Shiloh'?

I will first quote a very striking passage in which Dr. KURTZ justifies, in opposition to the violent denunciations of HENGSTENBERG, his own translation of the clause in question.

> The structure of the tenth verse will only allow of the word Shiloh being rendered as the *object*; for, if we render it as the *subject* of the verb—'until Shiloh come'—we at once destroy the parallelism of thought between the two clauses, and this parallelism is required by the arrangement of the verse. In the two clauses, 'till the Messiah comes,' and 'to him the obedience of the nations,' there is no parallelism at all, but merely a progress in the thought. If, however, we regard Shiloh as the object, and take Judah as the subject from the previous clause, the two clauses 'till Judah come to rest,' 'and the obedience of the nations shall be his,' harmonize admirably; for the obedience of the nations, who cheerfully and without resistance submit to Judah's rule, forms a part of the 'rest,' which Judah is to enjoy after the victorious conflict just before described. ii. *p.*41.
>
> The meaning of the prophecy is that Judah shall remain in uninterrupted possession of the rank of prince among his brethren, until through conflict and victory he has reached the object, and made the fullest display of his supremacy, in his own enjoyment of peaceful rest, and the cheerful obedience of the nations to his rule. Hence the *terminus ad quem*, which is mentioned here, does not set before us the limits or the termination of his supremacy, but rather the commencement of his secure and irresistible sway. And from this it follows quite as naturally, that the victory gained by Judah, and the blessings of peace which he secures, are shared by *his brethren* in all their fulness, because he fights as the prince and champion of his brethren. And not only so, but the blessings of this peace must be extended necessarily to all the *nations* who now cheerfully obey him. *p.*46.

Since the above was written, the passage before us has been most elaborately expounded by HENGSTENBERG. And, as my mode of treating the subject is keenly criticised, and warmly opposed, I am induced to add the following supplementary remarks. HENGSTENBERG'S work has left me more than ever convinced of the

correctness of my views, and the fallacy of those advocated by him; and his retractions, so far from improving his theory, have rather tended to deteriorate it. But the author has written in so confident a tone, made his assertions with such unbending determination, and heaped up such an overwhelming abundance of supposed proofs, that any reader, who does not examine his arguments with the most critical care, is likely to be dazzled and carried away by them.

He says 'The most superficial objections have been considered by HOFMANN, KURTZ, and others, sufficient to induce them to disregard the *consensus* of the whole Christian Church. We cannot, indeed, but be astonished at this.' I leave my readers to judge whether my reasons are 'superficial' or not. *I* do not think them superficial. But I am more concerned about the charge that I have set at nought the common consent of the whole Christian Church. I attach as much importance to the assurance, that I am supported by the common consent of the whole Christian Church, even in matters of exegesis, as my honoured opponent,—perhaps rather more; and I believe that my writings will bear comparison in this respect with those of HENGSTENBERG. Take, for example, his subtle and trifling remarks on the signs and wonders in Egypt, especially on the last plague. In this and many other instances, he has disregarded not only the consensus of the whole Christian Church, but that of all sound grammatical and historical interpretation, at which *I* was not the only one, or the first, to feel astonishment. No one, indeed, will deny, and least of all HENGSTENBERG himself, that even a Christian-minded commentator may and must deviate in many cases from the traditional exegesis. The consensus of the whole Christian Church has understood Ps.xxii.16 to refer to a piercing of the hands and the feet; but HENGSTENBERG, in his later writings, has disregarded this consensus. Many persons who have thus felt themselves deprived of one of the most cherished, most important, and most convincing predictions of the sufferings of Christ, have probably been as much surprised at this, as HENGSTENBERG himself at my interpretation of Gen.xlix.10. And yet he is undoubtedly in the right.

But let us look more closely at the common consent of the Christian Church in reference to G.xlix.10. It is true, the early Christian Church without exception referred this passage to a personal Messiah, and so did the ancient synagogue, *but* on the ground of a decidedly false rendering of the word in question, and one which HENGSTENBERG is no less confident in pronouncing false than I am, *viz.* the rendering given by the Septuagint and Vulgate. It is absurd for a man to boast of the consensus of the Church, when he has pronounced the very basis on which it rests, erroneous,—in other words, has pronounced the consensus itself to be without foundation. ii.*p*.63,64.

HENGSTENBERG has left the field of scientific discussion, and made a very cutting appeal to my conscience. I am far from denying that any one has a right to do this. But, before bringing against another charges so sweeping as those of 'naturalism,' of 'shaping history,' 'destroying prophecy,' and sacrilegiously 'wishing to teach God wisdom,'—charges, which, as HENGSTENBERG might well have known, would go to my heart like a two-edged sword,—it is a duty to weigh

the words employed with greater care than HENGSTENBERG, in his excessive zeal appears to have exercised. I desire no mercy even from HENGSTENBERG; but I desire justice and truth, and these I do not meet with. Nor can I avoid acknowledging that I look upon HENGSTENBERG, as having even less right than others to speak upon such subjects in a way like this; for, were he measured by his own standard, he would hardly escape the same, or, rather, I believe, far greater, condemnation. *I* shall not call it 'naturalism,' that we find him so often depriving miracles of their miraculous character, nor shall I say that he is a 'destroyer of prophecy,' though so frequently he dissipates the concrete substance of a prophecy into shadowy ideas. I will not speak of him as 'shaping history,' when he explains away everything in it that displeases him; nor will I charge him with 'wishing to be wiser than God,' when he so completely sets at nought all the laws of exegesis, in his interpretations of the miracles wrought by God for Israel, as to bring out exactly what *he* would have done, had he been in the place of God. As I have said, I neither will nor can bring such severe and unjust charges against him. But I say with confidence and without reserve, that, if HENGSTENBERG were measured by the same standard by which he has measured me, there are none of these charges which he would be able to rebut or evade. ii.69,70.

The above passages will show to how great an extent even the most conservative of modern German writers,—those, in fact, who have been appealed to,—as is commonly understood, under high episcopal authority,—as the very mainstay of English traditionary views, (*Quarterly Review*, No. 217, *p.*296),—have been obliged by the force of truth to abandon ground, which is still considered tenable, as sacred ground, in England. They will show also that the same unfair means of controversy can be used in Germany as have been so freely employed of late in England.

194. Dr. KURTZ then defends his own view of the present passage as follows:

(i) He abandons in common with HENGSTENBERG, as quite untenable, the notion that שִׁילֹה may be rendered 'he to whom it belongs,' ᾧ ἀποκεῖται, *Aq.*, *Symm.*, *Sept.* (most MSS.),—is, cujus est, *Syr.*, *Saad.*,—Messias, cujus est regnum, *Onk.*,—τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ, *Targ. Jon.*, *Sept.* (usual reading),—all which versions are founded on the mistake of supposing that שִׁילֹה, or as it appears in not a few Jewish, and all the Samaritan, MSS. שִׁלֹה, should be pointed שְׁלֹה, and is equivalent to שֶׁלּוֹ=אֲשֶׁר לוֹ, it being supposed that Ezek.xxi.27(32), עַד־בֹּא אֲשֶׁר לוֹ הַמִּשְׁפָּט 'until he comes to whom the right belongs,' is precisely parallel to, and, perhaps, is meant to have a reference to, the passage now before us, עַד־כִּי יָבוֹא שִׁלֹה. The Vulgate has 'qui mittendus est,' which implies that the root of the word was

supposed to be שָׁלַח, 'send.' The Sam. has 'donec veniat Pacificus,' apparently understanding the word to refer to Solomon, שְׁלֹמֹה, which is explained to mean 'Peaceable' in 1Ch.xxii.9.

(ii) HENGSTENBERG had formerly translated the passage under review 'till rest (*i.e.* the bringer of rest) shall come,' deriving the word שִׁילֹה from שָׁלָה. But שָׁלָה means 'to rest,' not 'to bring rest,' and therefore Shiloh, if derived in this way, would mean 'rester' or 'enjoyer of rest,' which will not suit the idea of the Messiah.

(iii) HENGSTENBERG himself has abandoned this interpretation, and now understands Shiloh as a kind of proper name, translating it 'man of rest,' and assuming a connection between the word, used as a name for the Messiah, and the *town* of Shiloh, so that Joshua gave the name to the town with reference to Jacob's words addressed here to Judah! But, says KURTZ,—'Can we conceive of the Jews returning from the Babylonian Captivity, and calling Jerusalem 'Messiah,' in commemoration of the rebuilding of the Temple? If not, it is just as inconceivable that Joshua, should have given the name Shiloh to the town (Taanath, Jo. xvi.6) where he erected the Tabernacle, if Shiloh was then, as HENGSTENBERG says, a proper name of the personal Messiah.'

(iv) KURTZ, on the other hand, translates Shiloh 'rest' or 'place of rest,' and supports his view at some length by critical arguments, which appear in the main to be sound and satisfactory. He considers that the old town of 'Taanath' received the name of Shiloh from Joshua, 'after the erection of the Tabernacle, with special reference to Jacob's prophecy.'

195. I adopt, generally, the views of KURTZ, but with this important difference, that I *reverse* the order of events, and believe the word to have been used in 'Jacob's prophecy,' with especial reference to the town already existing, for the following reasons.

(i) The fact, that the sceptre did undoubtedly depart from Judah some centuries before the coming of Christ, makes it impossible to believe that the usual interpretation, which refers the words to the Messiah, can be correct. And so observes KALISCH *in loc.*:—'As the empire of Judah ceased in the sixth century before the Christian era, and the tribe of Judah never afterwards obtained a permanent or brilliant political position, or received government over other branches of the Hebrews, and was, in the time of the Maccabees, subordinate to leaders from the tribe of Levi, this part of the prophecy cannot possibly refer, as commonly understood, to the Messiah.'

(ii) As KURTZ very pertinently asks, if the word is here to be understood of a personal Messiah, how are we to explain the fact that Moses' Blessing on Judah D.xxxiii.7, (whether written, as KURTZ supposes, in the Mosaic age, or, as we have shown (III.820) most probably about the time of Josiah), expresses only a somewhat mournful cry,—'Hear, Jehovah, the voice of Judah, and bring him unto his people; let his hands be sufficient for him, and be Thou an help to him from his

enemies,'—and contains not the slightest trace of the expectation of a personal Messiah, if that of Jacob had already announced the expectation in so clear and unmistakable a manner?

(iii) The words addressed to Judah in the 'Blessing of Moses' have a positive, as well as a negative, bearing on the question; for they refer back plainly to the words in the 'Blessing of Jacob,' though written (as we believe) at a time when the fortunes of Judah were very low, and they show that it is Judah, and not the Messiah, who is here spoken of:

*comp.* D.xxxiii.7, 'Hear, Jehovah, the voice of Judah, and bring him unto his people,' with G.xlix.10, 'and to him be the obedience of the peoples.'

(iv) The parallelism of the two last lines of G.xlix.10 seems to require KURTZ's interpretation. It is complete, if we render,—

'Till he (Judah) come to Shiloh,
And to him be the obedience of the peoples,'—

where the second clause expresses in a different form the same idea as the first, *viz.* Judah's coming to a state of glorious rest: whereas HENGSTENBERG (says KURTZ) admits that the parallelism is 'somewhat concealed' by his interpretation, inasmuch as the first clause would thus express the 'coming' of the Messiah, and the second the *consequence* of that coming, not the 'coming' itself in another form,—that is to say, the text has, in the second clause, 'and to him be the obedience of the peoples,' instead of—as it ought to have been in accordance with HENGSTENBERG's view—'and He, to whom shall be the obedience of the peoples.'

(v) Besides the present passage, the word Shiloh occurs in more than thirty places of the Old Testament, and occurs *in every single instance* as the name of a *town*. In fact, the very phrase which is here employed, יָבֹא שִׁלֹה, 'come to Shiloh,' occurs in 1S.iv.12. It is, therefore, most probable that in the passage before us also there is a reference to the town.

(vi) The word שִׁילֹה or שִׁלֹה is evidently derived from שָׁלָה, 'to enjoy rest,' as both HENGSTENBERG and KURTZ allow.

(vii) The name of the town, however it may have really originated, seems to be closely connected in the Book of Joshua with the idea of *rest after struggle* or *victory*. Thus we read—

'The whole congregation of the children of Israel assembled together at Shiloh, and set up the Tabernacle of the Congregation there; *and the land was subdued before them*,' Jo.xviii.1;

'And Jehovah gave unto Israel all the land which he sware to give unto their fathers; and Jehovah *gave them rest* round about,' xxi.43,44.

'Now Jehovah your God hath *given rest* unto your brethren, as he promised them,' xxii.4.

The setting up, therefore, of the Tabernacle at Shiloh was, according to the story, a sign of the conclusion of the conquest and their attaining to rest.

(viii) The writer, then, of the Book of Joshua seems to have treated the word Shiloh as equivalent to rest. And so says HENGSTENBERG, ii.*p.*11, 'There is probably an allusion to the name 'Shiloh' in Jo.xxiii.1, *comp.* xviii.1.'

(ix) It is probable that it is used also for 'rest' in the present passage, with a play upon the name of the *place* Shiloh—'until he come to Shiloh,'—which was, no doubt, a place well-known in the Jehovist's days: *comp.* 1K.xiv.2,4. Such a double meaning would suit the purpose of one, who was composing a *vaticinium ex evento*, as it would render the oracle only the more mysterious.

(x) We have a similar paronomasia by the same writer in G.xlviii.22, where he plays upon the word 'Shechem,' which is used in the sense of 'shoulder' = 'portion,' but with reference also to the place of that name.

And, in fact, the Chapter which we are now considering abounds with instances of such play upon words, *e.g.* in reference to the names 'Judah,' 'Zebulun,' 'Issachar,' 'Dan,' 'Gad,' 'Naphtali,' 'Ephraim': see *Analysis*.

196. Upon the whole, therefore, we conclude that this Blessing on Judah may very probably have been written *within the second decade of David's reign*. About the *twentieth* year he had gained his great successes over the Syrians, as described in 2S.x.13–19, when—

'all the kings that were servants to Hadadezer saw that they were smitten before Israel, and made peace with Israel, and served them,' *v.*19.

There now remained only the war with the Ammonites, during which David fell into his grievous sin with Bathsheba, 2S.xi. We might suppose the prophet NATHAN writing the passage before us, while the shouts of some recent victory were still ringing in his ears, and certainly *before* the guilt of David had been exposed, (about the *twenty-first* year of his reign, 2S.xii.14,) and brought a gloom upon the glowing prospects of Israel.

197. In fact, after this, David's days were full of bitterness. He finished, indeed, the Ammonite war by taking Rabbah, the chief city of Ammon, 2S.xii.26–31, and he seems to have had some later conflicts with the Philistines, xxi.15; but no other warlike exploit of his is recorded in the Book of Samuel. The dishonour done to Tamar, his daughter, 2S.xiii.14, (*comp.* that of Dinah, G.xxxiv, and see *Anal.*(241.xvi.N.B.)—the murder of his son Amnon, the ravisher, by Tamar's own brother, Absalom, *v.*29, (as Shechem is slain by Dinah's own brothers, G.xxxiv.26,)—the rebellion of Absalom, xv.10,—the defection of Ahitophel, xv.12,xvi.23, Bathsheba's grandfather, (*comp.* 2S.xi.3, xxiii.34)

—the flight of David from Jerusalem, xv.30, the insulting curses of Shimei, xvi.5–8,—the incestuous outrage upon David's wives, xvi.22,—the miserable death of Absalom, xviii.14,33,—the revolt of Sheba, xx.1,2,—the violence of Joab, xx.10,—the numbering of the people, which is described as bringing a pestilence on Israel, xxiv.1–15,—these fill up the remainder of the story of his life in the Book of Samuel, with 'lamentation, mourning, and woe.' And even his last days are disturbed with the insurrection of his eldest son Adonijah, 1K.i.5, and the intrigues of Nathan, Zadok, Benaiah, and Bathsheba, on the part of Solomon, his youngest son, *v.*11–49.

198. It seems very unlikely, then, that the passage before us could have been written *after* David's great sin. Before that event, he stood forth, no doubt, in the eyes of Nathan and the other great men of that day, as a glorious conqueror, the 'lion' of the tribe of Judah. Nay, I would even venture to suggest that the *Jehovistic* portions of Joshua may have been written with an eye to David himself. If *Samuel* was paired with *Moses* in the eyes of his disciples, as he is by Jeremiah, xv.1, in the only passage where he mentions Moses at all,—if the work of government and legislation, of which the Great Seer for many years had been the centre and moving-spring in Israel, bringing into order and consistency the rude elements of a long-enslaved and uncivilised people, 1S.vii.3,xiii.19–22, resembled in their view, as it certainly must have greatly resembled, the work ascribed to Moses in the Pentateuch,—then David, the young follower of Samuel, may have been regarded as the 'Joshua' of those days, the leader who should subdue the Jebusites, 2S.v. 6–10, smite the Philistines, *v.*20,25, vanquish all foes of the peace of Israel without and within, and settle the people down securely, under the kingdom, in the possession of the promised land.

199. There may, then, be a special significance in the reference to Shiloh, in this passage, more especially when we

observe that of the three passages quoted in (195.vii) which refer to Shiloh as the place of 'rest' for Israel, *viz.* xviii.1, xxi. 43,44; xxii.4, two—and, probably, all—appear, according to (7) in Chap. I, to belong to the *older* matter of the Pentateuch, *i.e.* to the Jehovistic writer of this very Chapter of Genesis, and not to the later Deuteronomistic insertions. It would seem, then, as we have said, that this 'Blessing on Judah' must have been written at some time during the second decade of David's reign,—perhaps about the *twelfth* or *fourteenth* year, B.C.1042, when the opposition of the northern tribes was at an end, so that his 'father's sons had bowed' to him, and when he had already 'come to rest' after his first great victories, over the Jebusites and Philistines, 2S.v.6–9,17–25, and still, as we are told, *v.*10,—

'went going and growing, and Jehovah of Hosts was with him.'

And it is noticeable that the very same expression is used to describe the state of Israel under *David* at this time, just after the Tabernacle had been set up on Mount Zion, 2S.vi.17,—

'Jehovah had given-rest to him round-about,' 2S.vii.1,—

as is used to describe the state of Israel under *Joshua*, just after the Tabernacle had been set up at Shiloh, Jo.xviii.1,—

'And Jehovah had given-rest to them round-about,' Jo.xxi.44.

# CHAPTER XIII.

## JACOB'S BLESSING ON JOSEPH, REUBEN, ETC.

### 200. JACOB'S BLESSING ON JOSEPH, *v.*22–26.

'A fruitful branch is Joseph,
A fruitful branch by a spring;
The sprouts mount over the wall.
And they embittered him and strove with him,
And hated him,—the lords of arrows.
Yet his bow abode in permanence,
And the arms of his hands were made strong,
From the hands of the Mighty-One of Jacob;
From thence is the shepherd, the stone of Israel.*
From thy father's El, and He shall help thee,
And El-Shaddai,† and He shall bless thee;
With blessings of the heaven from above,
Blessings of the deep couching beneath,
Blessings of the breasts and of the womb.
Thy father's blessings have prevailed
Above the blessings of the eternal mountains,‡
Above the delight of the everlasting hills.
May they be upon the head of Joseph,
And on the crown of the pre-eminent of his brethren!'

---

* This line is pronounced by LAND, *p.*77, to be so corrupt, that it is quite unintelligible. He produces a number of attempts from ancient and modern translators to obtain a meaning from it, which are all equally unsatisfactory. The LXX has *ἐκεῖθεν ὁ κατισχύσας Ἰσραὴλ παρὰ θεοῦ τοῦ πατρός σου*, *Cod. Vat.*; *ἐκ. ὁ κατισχ. σε Ἰακὼβ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ π. σ. Cod. Alex.*

† The *Sam. Text*, *Sam. Vers.*, and *Syr.* have this reading, וְאֵל שַׁדַּי for אֵת שַׁדַּי.

‡ The reading הַרְרֵי־עַד, 'mountains of eternity' instead of הוֹרֵי עַד, 'mountains, unto &c.,' is manifestly supported, not only by the parallel expression in the next clause, גִּבְעוֹת עוֹלָם, 'hills of everlasting,' but by the fact that in D.xxxiii.15 we have הַרְרֵי־קֶדֶם, 'mountains of old,' corresponding to the very same parallel expression.

201. Here again we shall find ourselves brought to the same conclusion as before. For this passage, with such warm laudations of Joseph, could not have been written so late as the time of Rehoboam, when the rupture took place between Judah and Ephraim, nor even in the latter part of Solomon's reign, when dissatisfaction already existed between them. Like the Blessing on Judah these words suit best *the second decade of David's reign*, before his sin with Bathsheba,—perhaps, not long after the time when the great northern tribes had joined him, and by their redundant population had formed, no doubt, the main body of his forces,—'Ephraim, the strength of his head,'—and had helped him greatly in achieving his recent conquests. At such a time such glowing words might readily have been applied to them by the most faithful adherent of the House of Judah. And, indeed, it would be very natural that an effort should have been made to soothe in this way any feelings of mortified pride, which might and, as later events showed, did actually exist in the tribe of Ephraim, at the supremacy being made over in such plain words to Judah. But the tone of tenderness in this address seems almost to imply a special affection—a personal interest—for the tribe of Joseph, as if the writer was himself an Ephraimite. And this agrees, as we have seen (175), with some other indications.

202. The expressions here used are generally intelligible enough, when we take account of the circumstances of the tribe of Ephraim, which, no doubt, is chiefly here referred to under the name of 'Joseph.' Its power—its numbers—the fertility of its soil, with its special 'portion,' xlviii.22, the vale of Shechem, 'so exceedingly verdant and fruitful,' and so strongly contrasting with the 'grey hills' and the 'wild country, more than half a wilderness' (Dean STANLEY) of Judea,—and its predominant influence among the northern tribes,—all are here very plainly depicted, and, as we have said,—with eulogies which seem to betray the writer as a true son of Ephraim. But there is

evidently a reference also to some great disaster which Ephraim had suffered, and apparently not long ago:

'And they embittered him, and strove with him,
And hated him—the lords of arrows.
Yet his bow abode in permanence, &c.'

203. To what can this last be meant to refer? May it be to the terrible slaughter of the Ephraimites which occurred in Jephthah's time, fifty years before Samuel, in the memory of the fathers of the old men of the present generation, when the Gileadites massacred them in cold blood at the fords of Jordan, to the number, we are told, of 42,000, Ju.xii.6—a number which, no doubt, is greatly exaggerated. But yet the whole account clearly implies a very deadly animosity and bitter hatred against them, among the men of Gilead at that time. 'The lords of arrows,' —*i.e.* metaphorically, their enemies— 'embittered him, and strove with him and hated him'; they struck him severely, and broke, it may be, for a time his power and influence; but now he had recovered his strength, and his position as the 'pre-eminent of his brethren.'

204. We may here complete what we have to say about the Blessings pronounced upon the other tribes, except that of *Levi*, which will require a special consideration.

JACOB'S BLESSING ON REUBEN, *v.*3,4.

'REUBEN, thou art my first-born,
My might and the first fruits of my strength,
Excellency of dignity, and excellency of power.
Bubbling like water, do not thou excel;*
For thou ascendedst thy father's bed;
Then defiledst thou my couch ascending.' †

REUBEN appears to have been the first Hebrew clan, that found its way from Egypt or elsewhere towards the land

* = 'do not take the first place among the tribes, as thy birthright would have otherwise entitled thee to do.'

† עֹלֶה, 'ascending,' instead of עָלָה, 'he ascended,' *i.e.* 'thou defiledst it in the very act of ascending,' LAND, *p.*44, who compares Hos.xiii.15.

of Canaan,—perhaps at a time previous to the great movement out of Egypt, which the traditions of the nation so well remembered. They settled, it would seem, on the East of Jordan, where they were subsequently joined by one or two other tribes, but were separated from the great body of kindred people by the Jordan and the Dead Sea. In this position, the tribe must have been exposed continually to the attacks of hostile hordes; and, instead of gaining any superiority over the rest, as might have been expected from its having been the *first-comer* (first-born), though it had chosen good pasture-grounds, and had large flocks and herds, it was, probably, an uneasy, distracted tribe, in a state of chronic weakness and discomfort, having perpetual troubles of its own, asserting, consequently, no 'rights of primogeniture,' claiming no leadership over the rest, nor stirring itself at any time, with vigorous, united action, to take part with the other tribes in their great national struggles, when their personal interests were not immediately concerned. Hence, Deborah, is made to complain,—

'For the divisions of Reuben there were great searchings of heart,' Ju.v.15,16.

205. History is silent on the point which gave rise to the legend recorded by this writer, xxxv.22, and here referred to, of Reuben's 'defiling his father's bed.' It may be, that living on the confines of Moab, the Reubenites had adopted many of their vicious practices, N.xxv.1; and in fact reference is made distinctly to the 'iniquity of Peor,' in the words which Joshua is said to have addressed to the *Reubenites*, when they had erected another altar 'beside the altar of Jehovah their God,' Jo.xxii.17–19. It may be that, in the writer's time, the Reubenites were notoriously given to such idolatrous practices, with all their impure and licentious rites, such as all Israel, and Judah also, fell into in yet later days. And thus, in his view, they had disgraced their parentage, and committed an outrage on the name and honour of their father, Israel, and were degraded justly from the honours of the first-born.

206. JACOB'S BLESSING ON SIMEON, *v.*5–7.

'SIMEON and Levi are brethren;
Instruments of wrong are their weapons.
In their circle let not my soul enter!
In their assembly let not mine honour be joined!
For in their anger they slęw a man,
And in their selfwill they houghed an ox.
Cursed was their anger, for it was fierce!
And their wrath, for it was hard!
I will portion them out in Jacob,
And scatter them in Israel.'

The Simeonites, in concert with the men of Levi, must have been notorious for some fierce and bloody transaction to account for the words here used. The writer, no doubt, is directly referring to his own account of the sack of Shechem in xxxiv. But, as that story can hardly be regarded as historical, it is probable that he had some other more recent events in his mind, which may not have been recorded in the history.

207. The language, however, here addressed to SIMEON and LEVI, involves manifestly a curse rather than a blessing. They were to be 'portioned out in Jacob and scattered in Israel.' We have already shown (III.816,817) that the Simeonites seem to have gradually dwindled away as a tribe, so that in the Blessing of Moses, D.xxxiii, written about the time of Josiah, and even in the song of Deborah, Ju.v, they are passed over altogether. Though seventeen cities are assigned to them in Jo.xix.1–9, yet in Saul's time one of them, *Ziklag*, was given by the Philistine king Achish to David, 1S.xxvii.6, and another, *Hormah*, was reckoned among the cities of Judah, 1S.xxx.30, and in David's time *Beersheba* was also reckoned to Judah, 2S.xxiv.7. Three others, *Gaza, Askelon, Ekron*, are reckoned as Philistine cities in 1S.vi.17: we are told in 2Ch.xi.6 that Rehoboam rebuilt *Etham* (or *Ether*), which was another of Simeon's towns, Jo.xix.7. In fact, almost all the seventeen Simeonite towns of Jo.xix.2–7 are reckoned to the tribe of Judah in Jo.xv.26,28–32.

Either the tribe was ultimately absorbed in that of Judah, or they were reduced in numbers greatly by some cause, such as *migration*, of which we see signs in 1Ch.iv.39. *Appendix* I.

208. The real fact was probably this, that the Simeonites were never strong enough to wrest from its original occupants any considerable portion of the land which they occupied, and make it their own. There are tribes such as these at this day in Natal, which in former times have migrated out of the Zulu country, as the Israelites from Egypt or elsewhere. Some have taken possession of lands in Natal, and acquired a settlement therein. Pakade's powerful tribe might be regarded as the 'Ephraim' of the northern portion of the colony; it is surrounded by other strong tribes; and, if at any time they resolved to form a confederacy, it would very probably be acknowledged by many of them as their head—the 'pre-eminent of his brethren.' It cannot now be said who was the 'first-born' in Natal of the Zulu,—or of Zulu, as the natives would say, using their ancestor's name, like 'Jacob' or 'Israel,' as a personal name,—in other words, which is the oldest tribe now left, either remaining from the ravages of their former tyrant Chaka, or having since his time been the first to come across the frontier river, the Tugela, which separates Natal from Zululand, as the *Hebrews* (lit. 'crossers-over') crossed the Jordan (or the Euphrates) when they came into Canaan. But it is, no doubt, some tribe, like Reuben, that will not now dare to claim its birthright.

209. Of course, under British rule, no tribe would be allowed to lord it over his brethren: nor, in fact, is there in Natal any royal tribe, like that of 'Judah,' which has at any time been acknowledged as sovereign over the whole native population. But we have 'Simeonites' in Natal,—people who really belong to one tribe, and call themselves by their tribal name, yet have never been able to get possession of land to any extent which they can call their own. Many of these have been absorbed in other

tribes, or migrated to other districts; while the rest live as they can,—'portioned-out and scattered,'—squatting, where they are allowed, upon the unoccupied lands of white-men, or settling down under the protection of some more powerful and prosperous tribe.

210. JACOB'S BLESSING ON ZEBULUN, *v.*13.

> 'ZEBULUN, on the shore of seas shall he dwell,
> [And that is on the shore of merchant-men,*]
> And his extreme-side unto † Zidon.'

There is considerable difficulty in reconciling this account of *Zebulun's* position with that assigned to *Asher* in Jo.xix. 24–31. In the carefully-drawn map of Dean STANLEY'S *Sinai and Palestine* it will be seen that no part of Zebulun reaches to the coast. And in fact Jo.xix.28 describes the tract of Asher as reaching 'to Great Zidon'—

> 'and then the coast turneth to Ramah and to the fortress of Tyre,' *v.*29.

And accordingly LAND observes, *p.*60—

> Where the maritime coast of Zebulun can have been I cannot see, Manasseh and Asher dividing between themselves the whole of the sea-coast in those parts. And even KEIL, a very stout defender of the traditionary view, distinctly says—'So far as the boundaries of this tribe can be determined by our Book of Joshua, its limits did not quite reach to the Mediterranean.' He adds, however, 'Perhaps, somewhat later it may have extended itself so far.' But he has no kind of proof for this but what is derived from the Poem before us.

211. In short, it is plain that to Zebulun is here assigned a portion of territory which in Jo.xix is ascribed to Asher. On this point EWALD writes as follows, *Gesch.*V.I.ii.*p.*381 (*Ed.*1853):

*LAND, *p.*61, suggests that this line may be merely a note of a later Editor, enlarging by way of explanation on the preceding clause. Near Jokneam, the town of Zebulun, which approached nearest to the sea, is found the best part of the Sinus Ptolemaicus, called by the Greeks Σύκαμίνος, by the natives, Ἥφα (EUSEB. *Sub voce* Ἰάφεθ). May not, he asks, this latter be derived from חוֹף, 'shore,' or חוֹף אֲנִיּוֹת, 'shore of merchantmen,' which was, perhaps, the Hebrew designation of this port or rather *roadstead*? Thus in the first word of the clause in question, וְהוּא, should be translated 'And *that* is' &c. = 'that is to say &c.,' and not 'And *he* &c.'

† עַד, 'unto,' with all the old Versions and Sam. Text, instead of עַל, 'upon.'

We have no intimation from any other quarter that Zebulun reached to the sea with even the smallest strip of its territory. But who will not admit, after the preceding explanations, that this utterance is much more suited to Asher? Deborah, in fact, speaks in these very terms of Asher, Ju.v.17, 'Asher dwelt on the shore of seas, &c.'; and since Deborah so exactly uses this strange expression, (which occurs nowhere else in the older passages, for in D.i.7, Jo.ix.1, it is the Deuteronomist who speaks,) it is plain that one of these passages must have a connection with the other. Thus the verse in Jacob's Blessing sounds only like a modification of the shorter[1] words of Deborah. Meanwhile, since we can scarcely be helped by supposing here a transposition of the names 'Asher' and Zebulun,' there remains no alternative but to assume that the writer of this Blessing,—according to all indications a man of Judah,[2]—had not quite accurately distinguished some of the four northern tribes according to their locality, as on the other hand Deborah does not name Judah.[3] This would thus be only a further indication of the great separation which subsequently developed itself between the most northerly and most southerly tribes, as will hereafter be shown.

*Ans.* (1) The notice about Zebulun in Deborah's Song, Ju.v.17, can scarcely be regarded as *shorter* than that in Jacob's Blessing, G.xlix.13,—especially, if the middle clause of the latter be removed (*p.*138, *note*) as a note of a later Editor.

(2) We have seen reason to believe (175,201,202) that the writer of 'Jacob's Blessing' was by birth a man of Ephraim, though attached to the kingdom of Judah, and probably one of the Prophets who lived in the Court of David.

(3) In Deborah's Song Judah may not be named because in the days referred to it was not very distinguished, and took no part at all in Barak's warfare.

212. May not the following conjecture explain the whole difficulty before us?

The words of Jacob's Blessing were written, as we have seen good reason for concluding, during the *second decade* of David's reign. At that time, no statistical information was possessed by the authorities as to the extent of the population or the territory of Israel. And it cannot be a matter of wonder that there should be some inaccuracy in describing the limits of some of the tribes, —as that of Zebulun,—which the writer knew to be living *near* the coast, and may have supposed actually to reach to it. But some time afterwards, David's famous *Census* of the whole land was taken—when Joab and the other commissioners, we are told,—

'came to Dan-Jaan, and about to *Zidon*, and came to the *stronghold of Tyre*, &c.: and, when they had gone through all the land, they came to Jerusalem at the end of nine months and twenty days.'—2S.xxiv.5–8.

During this time, then, the land was thoroughly *surveyed*. May not the Jehovistic portions of the Book of Joshua, which contain such a complete list of towns, &c., and define so precisely the boundaries of tribes, be the result of this inspection—having been written, as other portions of the Jehovistic narrative, towards the very end of David's reign, or in the beginning of Solomon's?

213. As to the 'Song of Deborah' we have already seen some reason to conclude (II.472) that it was written in David's reign, *after* the time when (as we still maintain) Ps.lxviii was composed, *viz.* the occasion of bringing up the Ark to Zion. There may then be, as EWALD suggests, a very close connection between 'Deborah's Song' and 'Jacob's Blessing,' for they may be the work of the very same age, though written at different times, the Blessing *before* the census of David, and the Song *after* it. That the writer has not removed the contradiction in question, will surprise no one who has considered how careless the Jehovist shows himself about contradicting himself, as well as the Elohist, in other instances.

214. It is noticeable that both here, in xlix.13, as well as in x.19, *Sidon* only is mentioned, and not Tyre, which became at a later time so famous, and was, in fact, nearer to the border of the land of Israel than Sidon. Dean STANLEY writes, *Sinai and Palestine, p.*270, note:—

> The original city or sanctuary [? stronghold] of Tyre [as at Gades, and as implied in Is.xxiii.2,6,] was on the *rocky* island: the city then spread itself far along the shore of the mainland. This city was entirely destroyed by Alexander, and its ruins were known as *Palæ-Tyrus* or '*ancient* Tyre,' in distinction from the 'new Tyre,' which he built, partly on the island, partly on the mole by which he joined the island to the shore.

Thus, at the time when the Jehovist wrote, Tyre may have had no territory on the mainland; and when it is said that the side of Zebulun should 'reach unto Zidon,' it may mean not to the *city* of 'great Zidon,' but merely to the territory belonging to it.

215. But the phenomenon here observed,—and yet more distinctly in x.19, where Sidon alone is named as the representative of all the cities of Phœnicia,—is observed also in HOMER, who never mentions Tyre, though he refers to Sidon repeatedly, *Il.* Z.291,T.743, *Od.*N.285,O.425. The *earliest* date assigned for any of the Homeric poems is B.C.1044, about the time at which (as we suppose) this 'Blessing of Jacob' was most probably written. At that time, then, according to this datum, Tyre was not yet famous as the large, rich, and populous city, the rival of its parent Sidon, which it afterwards became, though it existed, doubtless, as a city already, and according to JOSEPHUS, indeed, was built nearly two centuries before. Hence we find mention made in 2S.xxiv.6,7, of 'Zidon and the *fortress* of Tyre,' and in Jo.xix.28,29, we read of 'Great Zidon and the (city of fortress) fortified city of Tyre'; and Hiram, the king of Tyre, we are told, was on friendly terms with David, 2S.v.11, and Solomon, 1K.v.1,ix.11,12.

216. JACOB'S BLESSING ON ISSACHAR, xlix.14,15.

'ISSACHAR is an ass of bone,
Couching between the folds.
And he saw rest, that it was good,
And the land, that it was pleasant,
And he submitted his shoulder to bear,
And became a tributary of labour.'

Dean STANLEY notes, *Sinai and Palestine*, *p.*348 :—

There is another aspect under which the plain of Esdraelon must be considered. Every traveller has remarked on the richness of its soil and the exuberance of its crops. The very weeds are a sign of what in better hands the vast plain might become. The thoroughfare which it forms for every passage, from East to West, from North to South, made it in peaceful times the most available and eligible possession of Palestine. It was the frontier of Zebulun. 'Rejoice, O Zebulun, in thy goings-out.' But it was the special portion of Issachar; and in its condition, thus exposed to the good and evil fate of the beaten highway of Palestine, we read the fortunes of the tribe, which, for the sake of this possession, consented to sink into the half-nomadic state of the Bedouins who wandered over it, into the condition of tributaries to the Canaanite tribes, whose iron chariots drove victoriously through it.

217. Among those who came to David to Hebron, 'to turn the kingdom of Saul to him,' are mentioned, 1Ch.xii.32,—

'of the children of Issachar *they that had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do*; the head of them were two hundred, and all their brethren were at their commandment.'

In the case of all the other tribes, as Judah, Simeon, Ephraim, &c., we read of so many thousands for each, of men that 'bare shield and spear,' that were 'armed to the war,' 'mighty men in volour,' 'expert in war.' The account of the Chronicles, indeed, cannot possibly be true in all its details (III.817,note). But the description here given of the men of Issachar tallies quite with the politic character, which the Jehovist in the 'Blessing of Jacob' ascribes to them. They seem to have submitted themselves to their circumstances, whatever these might be, resolved to make the best of them.

218. JACOB'S BLESSING ON DAN, *v.*16–18.

'DAN shall judge his people,
As one of the staffs of Israel.
DAN is a serpent in the way,
A puff-adder in the path,
Biting the horse's heels,
And his rider falls backwards.
I wait for thy salvation, Jehovah!

In this account of DAN there appears to be a reference to the craft and cunning, which may have marked some of the transactions of the tribe. We have one instance of this recorded in Ju.xviii. There may be an allusion also to the last act of the Danite, Samson, which may have been current as a legend in the mouths of the people.

The exclamation in *v.*18 is peculiar, and is regarded by LAND, *p.*69, as a later interpolation. It appears to me intended as the expression of a burst of pious hope in the breast of the dying patriarch; and we may observe that in Deborah's Song there is a similar sudden exclamation, 'Bless ye, Jehovah!' Ju.v.9.

## 219. JACOB'S BLESSING ON GAD, xlix.19.

'GAD, a press (of people) shall press him;
But he shall press the heel.'

Dean STANLEY observes, *Sinai and Palestine, p.*327 :—

GAD has a more distinctive character, something of the lion-like aspect of Judah. In the forest-region of the Jabbok, he liveth 'like a lion,' D.xxxiii.20. Out of his tribe came the eleven valiant chiefs, who crossed the fords of the Jordan in flood-time, to join the outlawed David, 'whose faces were like the faces of lions, and who were as swift as the gazelles upon the mountains,' 1Ch.xii.8,15. These heroes were but the Bedouins of their time. The very name of Gad expressed the wild aspect which he presented to the wild tribes of the East. GAD is a 'troop' of plunderers: a troop of plunderers shall 'plunder' him, but he shall 'plunder' at the last.

## 220. JACOB'S BLESSINGS ON ASHER AND NAPHTALI, xlix.20,21.

'For ASHER shall his bread be too rich;
And he shall yield royal dainties.
NAPHTALI is a spreading terebinth;
He putteth forth goodly branches.' *

Dean STANLEY writes, *Sinai and Palestine, p.*265,363 :—

ASHER was the tribe to whose lot the rich plain of Acre fell. He 'dipped his foot in oil': his 'bread was fat, and he yielded royal dainties.'

NAPHTALI was to be like 'a spreading terebinth' of the Lebanon forest; he 'putteth out goodly boughs.' Compare the description by VAN DE VELDE of the country near Kadesh-Naphtali, as a 'natural park of oaks and terebinths.'

## 221. JACOB'S BLESSING ON BENJAMIN, xlix.27.

'BENJAMIN shall ravin as a wolf;
In the morning he shall devour the prey,
And in the evening he shall portion-out the spoil.' *v.*27.

Dean STANLEY notes, *Sinai and Palestine, p.*201 :—

In his mountain-passes, the ancient haunts of beasts of prey, Benjamin 'ravined as a wolf in the morning, descended into the rich plains of Philistia on the one side, and of the Jordan on the other, and 'returned in the evening to divide the spoil.' In the troubled period of the Judges, the tribe of Benjamin maintained a struggle, unaided, and for some time with success, against the whole

---

* We adopt here BOCHART'S reading, approved by EWALD, who points אַיָּלָה, 'terebinth', for אַיָּלָה, 'hind,' and אִמְרֵי, 'boughs,' for אִמְרֵי, 'words.'

of the rest of the nation. And to the latest times they never could forget that they had given birth to the first king.

That 'first king' of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, had just made way, as we believe, for the 'lion of the tribe of Judah,' when these words were written. That Saul himself 'ravined as a wolf,' we have sufficient evidence in the recorded transactions of his reign, as in 1S.xi.6,7,xiv.24,xv.7–9, and especially in the massacre of the priests at Nob, xxii.17–19. But the words seem here to be employed in politic commendation of the warlike spirit of the tribe.

# CHAPTER XIV.

## JACOB'S BLESSING ON LEVI.

222. We have now to consider the remarkable passage, xlix.5–7, with special reference to the tribe of Levi, having already treated of it as far as it concerns the tribe of Simeon.

'Simeon and Levi are brethren;
Instruments of wrong are their weapons.
Into their circle let not my soul enter
Into their assembly let not my honour be joined!
For in their anger they slew a man,
And in their selfwill they houghed an ox.
Cursed was their anger, for it was fierce!
And their wrath, for it was hard!
I will portion them out in Jacob,
And scatter them in Israel.'

223. Levi is here addressed in the same language of censure and condemnation, as Simeon, and the same severe sentence is here passed upon him, that he shall be—

'portioned out in Jacob, and scattered in Israel.'

The contrast between this language, and that used of the tribe of Levi by the Deuteronomist in the 'Blessing of Moses,' xxxiii.8–11, is as great as it can possibly be. *Here* the tribe is covered with contempt and infamy; *there* no words are strong enough to express their dignity.

'And of Levi he said:
Let Thy Thummim and Thy Urim be with Thy holy one,
Whom Thou didst prove at Massah,
Whom Thou didst right at the waters of Meribah;

Who said of his father and his mother, I saw him not,
Nor acknowledged his brethren, nor knew his own children;
For they observed Thy word,
And they kept Thy covenant.
They shall teach Jacob Thy judgments,
And Israel Thy Law;
They shall put incense before Thee,
And whole burnt sacrifice upon Thine Altar.
Bless, Jehovah, his substance,
And accept the work of his hands!
Smite through the loins of them that rise against him,
And of them that hate him, that they rise not again.'

224. The usual explanation of this contrast may be seen in the following note of the Rev. THOS. SCOTT:—

Levi and Simeon had been left under a severe rebuke by Jacob. And the tribe of Simeon had in no wise distinguished itself; on the contrary, it had been notoriously guilty in the transgression of Baal-Peor, and was greatly reduced in the wilderness. A portion, therefore, was assigned it within the lot of Judah, with which it was in great measure incorporated; and, perhaps, for that reason it was separately mentioned in this prophecy.

But the curse of Levi had been turned into a blessing, on account of the transactions here referred to. There were two *Meribahs*, one of which is also called *Massah*, where, probably, Aaron and the Levites remarkably distinguished themselves, in opposing the murmurs of the people. At the other Meribah Aaron was found guilty, Num. xx. 10–13. Yet there is a tradition (!) that the tribe of Levi approved themselves faithful. The prophet, however, in this passage seems to have referred to some remarkable instances not elsewhere recorded, in which the Levites were tried, and honourably distinguished themselves in the cause of God. In the provocation of the golden calf, the Levites, at God's command, inflicted punishment on the ringleaders, without respect to rank or relation, and in a very zealous and impartial manner, Ex. xxxii. 25–29. Perhaps some of their own tribe and near relations were involved in that guilt, whom they no more spared than other criminals. And, though men might censure this severity, yet God highly approved of it, and honoured those who so honoured Him.

225. It is true that Zimri, 'a prince of a chief house among the Simeonites,' was notoriously guilty, according to the story, at Baal-Peor, N.xxv.14: but there is no sign whatever that the *tribe* was more in fault than others. In that very sin of the golden calf, Aaron himself, the head of the tribe of Levi, was notoriously the chief offender. And, if the Levites spared not

their *fathers*; *mothers*, *brothers*, and *children*, then surely these relatives of theirs must have been guilty of the sin; and so the Levites themselves, as well as their leader, must have been concerned in that transaction. There is no ground, therefore, for supposing, as some have done, that Moses was ordered by Divine instruction to change Jacob's *curse* into a *blessing*, in reward for their dutiful conduct, so that they were still, indeed, to be 'portioned-out and scattered,' according to Jacob's words, but now to be honourably dispersed in their twenty-four Levitical cities. It would be strange, indeed, (if we were really bound to believe that Jacob's infallible prophetical insight, as to the future lot of his children, was displayed in this 'Blessing,') to find that he foresaw the future glory of the tribe of Judah, but had not the remotest idea of the splendour and dignity, to which the tribe of Levi would attain.

226. The real fact is that the 'Blessing of Moses,' as we have seen in Part III, was composed at a much later date than that, which we have been compelled by the facts of the case to assign to the 'Blessing of Jacob,'—at a time when the tribe of Levi was really held in high esteem and honour, and was composed, perhaps, by one who was himself a Levite and a Priest. Whereas in the time of the Jehovist, their condition, apparently, was as low, and their position as insignificant, as the words before us imply,—so far, at least, as we are able to gather from the facts narrated about them. This is a most important and interesting question; and it will be necessary to go into it at some length, and to endeavour to make out more clearly what was the true history of the tribe.

227. But, indeed, one of the most decisive proofs of the low condition of the Levites in the earlier part of David's reign, is this very fact itself that, in this passage of Genesis, which so many indications, as we have seen, show plainly to have been written about this very time, they are spoken of in such disparaging terms. It is evident that the writer knew

nothing whatever of this tribe having been appointed in the most solemn manner, by express Divine command, as the chosen tribe, to bear the sacred vessels, and minister in holy things, and approach nearer to the presence of Jehovah than others. It seems absolutely impossible that *any one*—at least, any pious writer—living after the age of Moses, should have expressed himself thus about the Levites, *if* the Books of Leviticus and Numbers had been in existence in his time, and their laws in operation *to any extent.*

228. Let us now see, however, what we can gather from the historical Books to throw light upon this point. We pass over the Book of Joshua, since that (as we have seen) must be regarded as a part of the Pentateuch itself; and we come at once to the Book of Judges, which relates the chief occurrences in Israel immediately after the (supposed) settlement of the people by Joshua in the Promised Land.

229. And here the first thing, which must surely strike the attention of any thoughtful reader, is the utter absence of any reference throughout the whole Book, professing to relate the history of four hundred years,—except in the two episodes introduced in the end,—even to the *existence* of Levites or Levitical Priests, as persons solemnly set apart for religious duties, much less to that high honour or distinction which the laws of the Pentateuch assign to them. There is no mention whatever made of them in the Song of Deborah, where nine of the tribes are named. And yet is it conceivable that a *Prophetess,* in such a pious song of thanksgiving, would have made no reference whatever to *Priest* or *Levite, Ark* or *Tabernacle,* if really these institutions existed, and were held in high esteem at the time? We shall have to consider the history of each of these four points separately, at full length, in its proper place, though not in this Part of our Work. At present, we are concerned only with the Levites. And these, as a *tribe,* are

never once mentioned in the Book of Judges, from the first chapter of the Book to the last, nor in its Appendix, the Book of Ruth. And the only two instances, in which the name Levite occurs, are cases which fully bear out the statement, that they had not at that time any such position of dignity and wealth, as the Pentateuch assigns to them,—no cities of their own, no maintenance, no tithes from the offerings of the people.

230. Thus in Ju. xvii.7-xviii.31 we read of—

'a young man out of Bethlehem-Judah, of the family of Judah, who was a Levite, and he sojourned there. And the man departed out of the city from Bethlehem-Judah, to sojourn *where he could find a place*.'

Accordingly, he comes to the house of Micah, 'a man of Mount Ephraim,' and is glad to engage himself to be his priest, for his food and clothing, and a small sum of money, ten shekels,* annually.

'*And Micah consecrated the Levite, and the young man became his Priest, and was in the house of Micah.*' Ju.xvii.12.

After this there comes a party of Danites;—

'And these went into Micah's house, and fetched the carved image, the ephod, and the teraphim, and the molten image. Then said the Priest unto them, 'What do ye?' And they said unto him, 'Hold thy peace, lay thine hand upon thy mouth, and go with us, and be with us a father and a Priest. Is it better for thee to be a Priest unto the house of one man, or that thou be a Priest unto a tribe and a family in Israel? And the Priest's heart was glad, and he took the ephod, and the teraphim, and the graven image, and went in the midst of the people. . . . . And the children of Dan set up the graven image. And Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Manasseh, he and his sons, were Priests to the tribe of Dan, until the day of the captivity of the land.' Ju.xviii.18-30.

231. On the above passage we remark as follows:—

(i) This Levite is evidently regarded as a mere straggler, having no house or home—no Levitical city to go to—no support from tithes and offerings. He 'goes to sojourn where he might find a place.'

---

* The value of this payment may be estimated from the command, 'that the rich shall not give more, and *the poor shall not give less*, than *half*-a-shekel, when they give an offering unto Jehovah, to make an atonement for your souls.' E.xxx.15.

(ii) It is noticeable that the writer does not record this story, as if he were *exceedingly shocked* at the idolatrous proceedings of Micah, the Levite, and the Danites. He seems to write of the transaction as if it were something not at all extraordinary in his times for a man to have a 'graven image' and 'teraphim' in his house, in direct violation of the laws of the Pentateuch, E.xx.4, L.xxvi.1, D.iv.16, v.8, xxvii.15. Nor can we be much surprised at this, since even David had 'teraphim' in his house, 1S.xix.13, though in our E.V. it appears merely as an 'image.'

(iii) There is no indication that even the Levite himself, or any of his employers, had any fear of the solemn charges of the Levitical Law before their eyes. The man of Mount Ephraim *consecrates* him—he becomes a *priest*—he ministers to *idols*; he then goes away contentedly with the Danites to act as their priest; they exchange him for a *Manassite* (whether through his death, or for some other reason); and this Manassite and his sons continue to act as priests to the *tribe* of Dan for a considerable time. Or if with many critics *we* read מֹשֶׁה, 'Moses,' for מְנַשֶּׁה, 'Manasseh,' it is still more amazing, on the traditionary view, that the 'son of Moses' should have taken part in such irregular proceedings; but he and his descendants would, of course, have been *Levites*.

(iv) We may add also that, as the story now stands, Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron, still lived, and 'stood before the Ark in *those* days,' xx.28,—that is, in the days of the affair about Gibeah, xix.1, *before* which Laish had already received the name of Dan, according to the narrative in xviii.29. Upon the traditionary view, it must certainly seem strange that Phinehas, who had actually received the promise of an everlasting priesthood because of his zeal for God on a former occasion, N.xxv.6–15, and who was sent by Joshua to warn the trans-Jordanic tribes of the trespass they were committing, in building another altar beside the Altar before the Tabernacle, Jo.xxii.13, &c., should now have permitted the setting up of a graven image, in direct breach of the Second Commandment, not only in the distant outpost of Dan, but in *Mount Ephraim*, not far from the Tabernacle itself.

(v) But the parenthetical passage about the Ark and Phinehas, Ju.xx.27ᵃ,28ᵇ, has all the appearance of being a later interpolation in the original story. And in (II.460,461) we have shown that, very probably, the notice in Ju.xviii.30, about 'Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Manasseh (or Moses), and his sons being priests to the tribe of Dan until the Captivity of the land,' is also an interpolation inserted after the Captivity of the Ten Tribes.

232. Upon the whole, however, it is plain that this 'Levite' is spoken of as being in a very low and impoverished condition, and certainly as having very little regard for, and apparently very little knowledge of, the commands and threatenings of the Mosaic Law. It may be said that the general neglect of the Levites as a tribe, which is implied not only in this story, but

throughout the whole Book of Judges, arose from the disordered state of the times, which had become thoroughly irreligious, and had lost all due veneration for the laws of Moses; and the abject circumstances of this young man may be ascribed to his own disorderly or profligate conduct. So writes Mr. SCOTT:—

This man's father was a Levite, but by marriage he was allied to the tribe of Judah, and so had been a sojourner at Bethlehem. But he left that place to seek some other situation. Perhaps, in those unquiet times, *the tithes were not paid very regularly.* Yet it can hardly be supposed that a Levite of good character was constrained, from mere want, to ramble like a vagabond. He seems to have been a man of unsettled disposition, who did not choose to be under the control of the Priests.

233. At present, however, we are concerned only with the facts themselves, as indications of the probable state of the Levites in the time of David, to which the rest of the evidence has been clearly pointing, as the time of the composition of this Chapter of Genesis. We find, then, that in the whole Book of Judges there is no sign of respect paid to the tribe of Levi. It is not even alluded to in the Song of Deborah: in the story, which we have just been considering, the Levite is a needy vagabond; and in that which follows, xix,xx, he is just such another poor straggler, who lived not in any 'Levitical city,' but 'sojourned on the side of Mount Ephraim,' xix.1. He says in his story that he was going with his concubine to the 'House of Jehovah,' *v.*18,—it might be, to minister, or it might be only for some private religious purpose of his own, as Elkanah did regularly, year by year, in the time of Eli, 1S.i.3. For no intimation whatever is given that he had any charge at the Tabernacle, any sacred office or duty, as a Levite, which he was going to perform there. If he had, however, we have sufficient proof how lightly it was esteemed in those days by the treatment which he received, xix.22.

234. It may be said, indeed, that Micah's words in Ju.xvii.13—

'Now know I that Jehovah will do me good, seeing I have *a Levite* to my priest'—

imply that a certain sort of sacredness of character attached in

those days to a Levite. *Perhaps*, this may be true; and yet it by no means follows certainly from this passage. For the Hebrew says distinctly, 'seeing I have *the* Levite (=this Levite) for a priest'; and '*a* Levite' would be expressed properly by אִישׁ לֵוִי, 'a man of Levi,' as it is in xix.1. The point of the words seems rather to be, not that Micah has secured a *Levite* for sacred offices, but that he has a man now regularly engaged, consecrated and set apart by himself, supported and paid by himself, to be his priest,—in short, that he has established regular religious worship in his house, has built himself a private chapel, and engaged a man to act as 'chaplain.' In fact, there is nothing here to show that, if any other straggler—say, a man of the *other* dependent tribe, a poor Simeonite—had come, like this Levite, seeking 'a place where he might lodge,' and had been willing to be consecrated on the same terms, Micah would not have taken him quite as readily, and said quite as confidently,—

'Now know I that it will go well with me, seeing that I have this Simeonite for a priest.'

235. It is *possible*, then, that the Levites existed already, in the time of the Judges and afterwards, as a sacred caste, having been set apart for religious offices in Egypt or during the march to Canaan, but, of course, in some natural way, very different from that described in the Pentateuch. But this view derives no distinct support from anything which we read in the Book of Judges; and it is rather negatived, than otherwise, by the manner in which the two Levites are introduced, and especially by the strange silence of the Song of Deborah as to any such sacred privileges and duties of the tribe, nay, as to its very name and existence. And the Song of Deborah, we must remember, reflects the spirit of the time in which it was written, —which we believe to be the latter part of David's reign. If we are right in this, it would follow that even in that day the tribe had not yet attained a position and influence, which

required its being mentioned with any special respect. Or else, we must conclude that the writer, throwing himself as much as possible into the spirit of Deborah's time, was well aware that in those days there was no such respect paid to the Levites.

236. We repeat, however, we are not now required to decide the question as to the real origin of the Levites, or to determine whether they existed, from the first entrance into Canaan, as a sacred caste, or whether, as some suppose, their being coupled with Simeon, in the passage of Genesis before us, shows that their lot had been hitherto very much the same as that of Simeon, that of poor and needy, landless, wanderers,—'portioned out in Jacob and scattered in Israel.' The question at present is merely this: What was their condition about the second decade of David's reign, when the Chapter before us, as we believe, was written? We have tracked the notices about them in the Book of Judges: in Ruth they are not named: let us now see what we may gather from the Book of Samuel.

237. The first mention of the Levites in the Book of Samuel is in 1S.vi.15, when an interval of about *two centuries and a half* had elapsed since the above two events; and this, indeed, is the first mention in the history, after the Pentateuch and Book of Joshua, of the Levites as acting in any official capacity:—

'And the Levites took down the Ark of Jehovah, and the coffer that was in it, wherein the jewels of gold were, and put them on the great stone.'

This certainly seems at first sight to be a plain recognition of the official position of the Levites according to the Mosaic Law: for it *was* the duty—not indeed of the Levites generally, but—of the 'sons of Kohath,' to carry the Ark, N.iv.1–15. But it will be seen that the Levites appear here upon the scene very strangely and suddenly. Not a word is said to introduce them, nor are they named in the history for some centuries before, or for a century after, this event. Only in this one single verse, *v.*15, they appear at the critical moment to take down the Ark,

which according to the Law, N.i.51, it was unlawful, on pain of death, for any mere layman to do.

238. But it was just as unlawful for common Levites to *touch* the Ark: they were not to come near to bear it, until the Priests had first duly *covered* it:—

'When Aaron and his sons have made an end of covering the Sanctuary and all the vessels of the Sanctuary, *after that* the sons of Kohath shall come to bear it: but they shall not touch any holy thing, lest they die,' N.iv.15;

'They (the Kohathites) shall not go in to see when the holy things are covered, *lest they die*,' *v.*20.

Will it be said that the *necessity* of the case excused them? But, according to the story, Uzzah was struck dead for putting forth his hand to save the Ark from falling, 2S.vi.6,7. And Uzzah was the son of Abinadab, in whose house the Ark was kept so long at Gibeah, *v.*3,4, and whose grandfather, it would seem, 'Eleazar son of Abinadab,' was 'sanctified to *keep* the Ark' in Samuel's time, 1S.vii.1. Either then Eleazar was a *layman*, and yet he had charge of the Ark, or he was a *Levite*, and therefore Uzzah was a Levite, and his offence of touching the Ark merely to stay it was punished with death!

239. Will it be said, Bethshemesh was a 'city of the priests,' Jo.xxi.16, and these Levites, doubtless, were *priests*, who lived at Bethshemesh, and who 'offered burnt offering and sacrificed sacrifices the same day to Jehovah,' 1S.vi.15? Yet how did these priests, if they knew the Law, dare to offer sacrifice in an unconsecrated place, upon this stone, instead of on the Altar before the Tabernacle, D.xii.13,14, Jo.xxii.29? Or, if it be said, the presence of the Ark consecrated the stone, and made this exceptional act allowable, yet how did they dare to offer as a *burnt*-offering *milch-kine*, *v.*14, when the Law had distinctly commanded,—

'If his offering be a *burnt*-sacrifice of the herd, let him offer a *male* without blemish'? L.i.3.

240. Thus on all hands we are met with difficulties, and direct contradictions to the strict injunctions of the Mosaic Law. When, however, we look closely at the connection in

which *v.*15 stands, we shall see very plainly that it is a later interpolation into the original story. For just before we read,—

'And they of Bethshemesh were reaping their wheat-harvest in the valley; and they lifted up their eyes, and saw the Ark, and rejoiced to see it. And the cart came into the field of Joshua the Bethshemite, and stood there, where there was a great stone; and they *clave the wood of the cart, and offered the kine a burnt-offering unto Jehovah*,' *v.*13,14.

And then, *after* this—after the cart had been *broken up and burnt*—we are told that 'the Levites took down the Ark' from the cart, and 'placed it on the great stone,' on which, apparently, the kine had just been offered, and it is added—

'the men of Bethshemesh offered burnt-offerings and sacrificed sacrifices the same day unto Jehovah'—

when we have just been told that they had 'offered the kine!'

241. In short, the verse about 'the Levites' quite obstructs the flow of the narrative in 1S.vi, and introduces several discrepancies. It has plainly been inserted by a later hand, in order to avoid the appearance of a sacrilegious act in the original story, if any but 'Levites' were permitted to handle the Ark; and by 'Levites' probably are meant 'priests,' as always in the later history. HENGSTENBERG, indeed, says, ii.58:—

This difficulty is a selfmade one. The first sacrifice was presented not on the part of the inhabitants of Bethshemesh, but on the part of the Philistines, and *for* them, if not *by* them. That this act *principaliter*, if not also *ministerialiter*, belonged to the Philistines, we infer not only on the grounds already adduced by SCHMID, *viz.* that 'this sacrifice is mentioned separately, and that to the Bethshemites not *this*, but other burnt-offerings and sacrifices are presently attributed,' but because the words 'and they clave the wood &c.,' naturally can be referred only to the Philistines, since up to this time they had been the only persons who had to do with the Ark, the taking-down by the Levites not being mentioned till *v.*15.

*Ans.* According to the story, the kine were not driven, but left to themselves to take what way they pleased, *v.*8,9, and the 'lords of the Philistines followed behind *until* they reached the border of Bethshemesh,' *v.*12, while the kine went on, and came into the field of Joshua, *v.*14. The Bethshemites were 'reaping'; *they* 'lifted up their eyes'; *they* 'saw the Ark,' and *they* 'rejoiced to see it,' *v.*13. And the narrative goes on—'And the Ark came into the field of Joshua; and *they* (plainly, still the Bethshemites) clave the wood and offered the kine,' *v.*14. And then it is said, 'when the five lords of the Philistines had *seen it* (not 'had sacrificed'), they returned to Ekron the same day.'

242. In fact HENGSTENBERG has to eke out his explanation thus:—

As it is not allowable to have recourse to a corruption or interpolation, unless every other mode of explanation fails, it must be admitted that the author follows not a chronological order, but an arrangement founded on the different parties engaged in the transaction, and thus everything will be in its proper place. He relates what the *Philistines* did—they sacrificed the kine (A)—then what the Israelites did, *i.e.* (i) the *Levites*, on whom according to the Law the carrying of the Ark devolved—they took it down and placed it on the great stone (B)—(ii) the *Bethshemites*,—they offered sacrifices (C). Thus everything is most suitably arranged. The author might the more readily adopt this method, since the *chronological* order, *viz.* B (the taking-down of the Ark), A (the sacrifice of the Philistines), C (the sacrifice of the Bethshemites)—is *self-evident*.

Rather, it is 'self-evident' that the story, as it stands, is contradictory, and that *v.*15, about the 'Levites,' is an interpolation.

243. After this, *more than a century* elapses before the name 'Levite' occurs again in the more authentic history. Then we read, 2S.xv.24, that when David fled from Jerusalem before his son Absalom,—

'Zadok also and all the Levites were with him, bearing the Ark of the Covenant of God.'

At this time, then, the Levites, it would seem, were certainly employed in sacred offices; and such words as those addressed to them in G.xlix.7 would hardly, we must suppose, have been written in this age about them. This furnishes us, therefore, with a date, B.C. 1023, *after* which the 'Blessing of Jacob' could scarcely have been written. We have already set the date of its composition (199) about twenty years previously—perhaps, about the time referred to in 2S.vii, when David 'sat in his house,' and 'Jehovah had given him rest round about from all his enemies'—for a time, at least, for some of his great conquests follow afterwards, viii—and he thought of building a House for Jehovah, and received the promise of an everlasting kingdom, vii.16.

244. Yet up to this time there is no indication in his history of any respect being paid to the Levites. When David brings

up the Ark to Jerusalem, 2S.vi.1, not a word is said about the Levites carrying it, or even being present on the occasion. No mention, in fact, is made of *Priest* or *Levite*. Nay, the express commands of the Pentateuch were flatly disobeyed in the matter. 'They set the Ark of ELOHIM upon a new cart,' we are told, *v.*3, where 'they' refers plainly to 'David and all the people that were with him,' *v.*2. If it be said that these *included* Priests and Levites—though it is very strange that these should not be even mentioned—yet why, then, did not the Priests 'cover' the Ark and the Levites 'carry' it, as they are supposed to have done during so many long marches in the wilderness, and as they were expressly commanded to do, N.iv.15?

242. So it is *David*, who 'sacrifices oxen and fatlings,' *v.*13, —even as Samuel and Saul, though neither of them a Priest, had done repeatedly before him. *David* wears a 'linen ephod,' *v.*14, the Priestly dress. And then we read—

'David and all the House of Israel brought up the Ark of Jehovah, and *set it in its place in the midst of the Tabernacle* that David had pitched for it, and *David offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings before Jehovah*. And, as soon as David had made an end of offering burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, *he blessed the people in the Name of Jehovah of Hosts*.' *v.*15,17,18.

We should have expected surely, on the traditionary view, that the *High Priest*, and not David, would have blessed the people on this solemn occasion, as in L.ix.22—

'And Aaron lifted up his hand toward the people and blessed them,'—

in accordance with the direction in N.vi.23–27,—

'Speak unto Aaron and unto his sons, saying, On this wise ye shall bless the children of Israel, saying unto them,

Jehovah bless thee and keep thee!
Jehovah make His Face to shine upon thee and be gracious to thee!
Jehovah lift up His Countenance upon thee and give thee peace!

And they shall put My Name upon the Children of Israel, and I will bless them.'

246. It may, of course, be said that David 'sacrificed' *by means* of a Priest, though this can hardly be said of his

'blessing.' But there is no indication in the story that David did so, or that Saul or Samuel did so. Thus we read as follows:—

'And *Saul* said, Bring hither a burnt-offering to me and peace-offerings. And he offered the burnt-offering,' 1S.xiii.9;

'And *Samuel* took a sucking-lamb, and offered it for a burnt-offering unto Jehovah,' 1S.vii.9;

just as we have had also in Genesis,—

'And *Noah* built an altar to Jehovah, . . . and he offered burnt-offerings upon the altar,' viii.20;

'And *Israel* sacrificed sacrifices unto the Elohim of his father Isaac,' xlvi.1.

247. In short, exactly as in the Book of Judges, *Gideon* the *Manassite*, vi.26,27, and *Manoah* the *Danite*, xiii.19, offer sacrifices themselves,—plainly without the intervention of a Priest or Levite,—so here there would be no doubt, except for its directly contradicting the laws of the Pentateuch, that David did actually in his own person offer the sacrifices on this occasion,—that is, he did not himself kill the animals, but he 'blessed the sacrifice,' 1S.ix.13, and performed what other ceremonies constituted in those days the act of 'offering.'

248. Just so we find it stated in 1K.viii.55 that *Solomon* '*blessed* the congregation of Israel,' and in *v.*64 that *Solomon* '*consecrated* the middle of the court that was before the House of Jehovah,' and in ix.25 that *Solomon* '*offered incense* upon the Altar that was before Jehovah,'—which last act he could hardly have done 'by means of the Priests,' any more than the first. Yet for offering incense, Korah, though a Levite, and Dathan and Abiram were destroyed, N.xvi, and their brazen censers made into a covering for the Altar,—

"to be a memorial unto the children of Israel, that no stranger, *which is not of the seed of Aaron*, come near to offer incense before Jehovah, that he be not as Korah and his company,' *v.*40;

and for attempting to do it, according to the Chronicler, 2Ch.xxvi.16–21, Solomon's descendant, King Uzziah, was in later days stricken with leprosy.

# CHAPTER XV.

## THE LEVITES IN THE TIME OF DAVID.

249. We have thus seen sufficient proof that at the time when we suppose 'Jacob's Blessing' to have been written—perhaps, about the time of the bringing up of the Ark, or not long after it,—the Levites must have been, to all appearance, in a low and insignificant position. Not only are they not named in the history of 2S.vi, but in the very Psalm, lxviii, which is believed generally (and we also believe this) to have been written on this very occasion, of the bringing-up of the Ark to Mount Zion, not the slightest reference is made to the tribe of Levi, as having any special duties on that occasion, or any special rank and privileges in Israel; nor are they even mentioned at all, although Benjamin, Judah, Zebulun, and Naphtali, are each expressly named, *v.*27. And the Levites are equally ignored in Ps.lx, which belongs most probably to a somewhat later period of the same age, and in which Gilead and Manasseh, Ephraim and Judah are especially mentioned, *v.*7.

250. Nay, all the conditions of the Priesthood, as we gather them from the more authentic history, were in those days utterly at variance with the laws and examples of the Pentateuch. In David's time, 2S.viii.17, and in Solomon's, 1K.iv.4, we have *two* chief priests, instead of *one*, like Aaron, Eleazar, or Phinehas. And the two are not father and son, or elder and younger brothers, but apparently not closely related to each other, and in Solomon's days in direct opposition and hostility to each

other, 1K.i.7,8,25,26. And accordingly Solomon, a youth of eighteen, 'thrusts out' Abiathar, 1K.ii.27, the older of the two chief priests, and therefore, if any, the *true* High-Priest, 'anointed with the holy oil,' L.xxi.10, N.xxxv.25, who 'bare the Ark before David his father,' and 'Zadok the Priest did the king put in his room,' 1K.ii.35. It is plain—whatever may have been the case in *later* or in *earlier* days—the 'priests' of the time of David and Solomon were merely nominees of the king's own appointment; and as such they are ranked among the king's chief officers, but *low down in the list*, 2S.viii.16-18, 1K.iv.2-6, instead of at the head of all, in accordance with the Pentateuch, where Aaron ranks everywhere next to Moses, and Eleazar to Joshua, or even before him, Jo.xiv.1.

251. When, therefore, we read of 'Zadok, and all the Levites with him,' in attendance upon David in his flight, bearing out of Jerusalem the Ark of the covenant, and of Abiathar 'going-up' with David also, 2S.xv.24, and of Zadok and Abiathar being sent back with the Ark to stay in the city, and do their best to keep it for David, *v.*29, we have evidence certainly that there were Levites attached at that time to the Sanctuary, with two Priests at their head; but we have no ground to infer that the former were a numerous and influential body, or the latter were invested with anything like the power and dignity which are ascribed to them in the Pentateuch. In Josiah's time, when, no doubt, the Priests had considerable influence, there was one 'chief Priest,' some 'Priests of the second order,' and others, 'keepers of the door,' 2K.xxiii.4, who are expressly called 'Priests' in 2K.xii.9. In Zedekiah's days, there were only *five* Priests altogether ministering in the Temple, 2K.xxv. 18, 'a chief' and a 'second' Priest, and three 'doorkeepers.' It is probable that in David's time, in the Tabernacle, and still more in Solomon's time in the Temple, there was a larger number of Levites in attendance upon the two chief Priests. Yet, until David set up the Tabernacle on Mount Zion, in con-

nection with which he probably called into activity some number of the Levites, there appears no sign of their having at all emerged from the obscurity, in which for some centuries at least before that time they appear to have been lying.

252. But the question arises, was SAMUEL himself a Levite? We read in 1S.i.1, that Samuel's father Elkanah was—

'a man of Ramathaim-Zophim, of Mount Ephraim. . . an Ephrathite.'*

Here there would be no doubt that the epithet 'Ephrathite,' when used of a man living in 'Mount Ephraim,' means '*Ephraimite*,' as it does in 1K.xi.26, where we read of 'Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, an Ephrathite, of Zereda.' But then we come upon the difficulty (upon the traditionary view) that Samuel, an *Ephraimite*, should be found discharging so many duties peculiar to *Levites*. And this, of course, is assumed to have been impossible, and would in fact have been impossible, if the Pentateuch really existed in that age.

253. Accordingly, it is usual to explain the word 'Ephrathite' as meaning here a man of Bethlehem-*Ephrata*, as in fact it

* Eight places claim to be the Ramah of Samuel, none of them, however, in the tribe of Ephraim. All that we know certainly about the place is that it was on an eminence, as its name Ramah implies, and was situated somewhere *south* of Gibeah, the birth-place of Saul. From the dual form of the name, Ramathaim, it might be inferred that it was an eminence with a double height, on which, no doubt, in times of danger, the 'watchers,' Zophim, took their station. From the text it is plain that Elkanah was either living at Ramah, though born in Mount Ephraim, or *vice versâ*. We assume (with Dean STANLEY) the former, because we find Samuel afterwards having his home at Ramah, 1S.vii.17, and it seems most natural that the place of residence should *first* be mentioned, and then the place of birth. See Dean STANLEY's note, *Sinai and Palestine*, *p*.224.

It is noticeable that the *country near Ramah* is called in 1S.ix.5, 'the land of Zuph,' and Zuph was Samuel's grandfather, 1S.i.1. So in Zululand, a certain district is called Kwa 'Magwaza, 'the land of Magwaza,' from a grandfather of the present generation, who settled there. Is there any connection between the name of the man Zuph (צוּף), and the name of the town, Ramathaim-*Zophim* (צוֹפִים)? The LXX has here a singular reading ἐν Νασὶβ Ἐφραΐμ, as if for בֶּן־צוּף אֶפְרָתִי, there had been read בְּנָצִיף אֶפְרָיִם.

does in R.i.2, 1S.xvii.12. And, though indeed a man of Bethlehem-Ephrata, which was a city of Judah and not a Levitical city, would naturally have been a *man of Judah*, as in both the cases just quoted, yet, it is said, Elkanah may have been a Levite, who formerly *lived* in Bethlehem, though he now lived in Mount Ephraim, as we read elsewhere of—

'a young man out of Bethlehem-Judah, out of a family of Judah, and he was a Levite,' Ju.xvii.7.

And, in support of this view, great stress is naturally laid upon the statement of the Chronicler, 1Ch.vi.33–38, where the genealogy of Heman, Samuel's grandson, is traced up to Levi.

254. On this we observe as follows.

(i) If Elkanah *was* a Levite, the difficulty is not really removed. For he certainly was not a *Priest*, and yet we find Samuel acting repeatedly in the Priest's office, 1S.vii.9,x.8, which according to the Pentateuch it was forbidden to do under pain of death, N.iv.9.

(ii) If Samuel was a Levite by birth or was believed by the writer of 1S.i–iii to have been a Levite, what is the meaning of the language ascribed to Hannah, 1S.i.28,—

'therefore also have I lent him to Jehovah, as long as he liveth he shall be lent to Jehovah,'—

since he belonged by the Mosaic Law to Jehovah from his birth?

(iii) If Elkanah was, indeed, a Levite, surely this would have been stated in 1S.i.1, where the description given of him is very circumstantial,—

'a certain man [why not a 'certain Levite,' as in Ju.xix.1?] of Ramathaim-Zophim, of Mount Ephraim, and his name was Elkanah, the son of Jeroham, the son of Elihu, the son of Tohu, the son of Zuph, an Ephrathite.'

(iv) The term *Ephrathite* could surely not have been used for a *Levite*, who was *born* in Mount Ephraim and was now *living* at Ramah, merely because he had formerly *sojourned* for a time in the town of Bethlehem. The young man in Ju.xvii.7 is not called an *Ephrathite* because he had lived in Bethlehem, but a

Levite—'I am a Levite of Bethlehem-Judah,' *v.*9. If Elkanah had either been *born* at Bethlehem, or had been *living* there at the time referred to in 1S.i, it is conceivable that he might have been called an Ephrathite. But he was born of a family settled in Mount Ephraim, and he was living at Ramah.

255. The description of this young man, a *Levite*, 'out of Bethlehem-Judah, out of a '*family of Judah*,' is certainly remarkable. KEIL'S note is as follows, *Bibl. Comm.*iii.*p.*329 :—

> Bethlehem was not a Levitical town. The young Levite out of Bethlehem was neither born there, nor had the right of citizenship there: he only sojourned there for a time as a stranger. Also the further datum as to his origin, 'out of a family of Judah,' is not so to be understood as if he had been a descendant from a family of the tribe of Judah; but it is only said that he belonged to the Levites who dwelt in the tribe of Judah, and were reckoned in a civil point of view to this tribe. At the division of the land, it is true, only the *priests* had their towns allotted in the tribes of Judah and Simeon, Jo.xxi.9–19; whereas the other Levites, even the families of Kohath which were not of the priestly order, obtained their towns in the other tribes, Jo.xxi.20, &c. Meanwhile, many of the towns, which were allotted to the different tribes, remained even long after the partition of the land in the possession of the Canaanites, and the Israelites did not immediately enter upon the full and uncontested possession of their inheritance. And so also some towns, which were allotted to the Levites, might easily remain in the possession of the Canaanites, and the Levites might be compelled in consequence to seek admission into other places. So, too, some Levites, who did not wish to undertake the duties assigned to them by the Law, might wander out of the Levitical towns, and seek elsewhere some means of livelihood.

But there is not the slightest indication in the history that the Levites ever lived in their 'Levitical cities,' or that any such cities ever existed. If Samuel was a Levite, he lived at *Ramah*, 1S.vii.17, which was not a Levitical or Priestly city, nor was Nob, though called the 'city of the Priests,' 1S.xx.11–19. The fact is that, up to David's time, the Levites seem to have had no homes at all; but to have taken up their abodes where they could in the 'families' of other tribes.

256. Upon the whole we conclude that Samuel, the Elohist, was probably not a Levite, but an Ephraimite by birth, as well as his disciple, the Jehovist (174, 201). And so judges KUENEN,

*Eng. Ed. p.*175, in common with most modern liberal critics. At all events, there is no trace in his history of any connection with the Levitical system of the Pentateuch. It is, in fact, incredible that, if he had really been a Levite, to whom according to the Law belonged especially the care of Divine things, he would have allowed the Sacred Ark to be laid aside, like a piece of useless lumber, in the house of Abinadab, 1S.vii.1, where it remained during all the rest of his life and altogether for eighty years. Still less can we suppose that Samuel, a Levite, with the Pentateuch in his hands, would have set the people an example of direct disobedience to the plain injunctions of the Law, by 'building an altar to Jehovah at *Ramah*,' 1S.vii.17, beside the Altar that was before the Tabernacle, and by offering sacrifices at Gilgal, 1S.x.8, xi.15.

257. It is true, the *Chronicler*, writing long after the Captivity, traces up very distinctly the genealogy of Samuel to Levi, 1Ch.vi.33–38. But this must be classed with other instances, which we have had before us, of the untrustworthy character of this writer's statements. It is useless and wrong to disguise the matter: it would be treason to the Truth itself to do so. The Chronicler's data are manifestly very strongly coloured in numerous instances by the desire to show in former days some signs of close conformity with the directions of the Law or of some evil consequences resulting from the neglect of them. And whatever he says bearing upon matters connected with the Priesthood or the Levites,—to which body he seems to have belonged (II.234)—must be received at all times with great caution, and must often be rejected altogether.

258. Thus we have seen that the Book of Samuel gives not the least indication of the tribe of Levi being distinguished in any way, for their numbers, dignity, or influence, in the time of David, and especially is altogether silent as to any great body of Priests and Levites having been present on the occasion of

bringing up the Ark to Jerusalem, 2S.vi. On the contrary, this supposition is distinctly negatived by the facts actually stated. Instead of the Priests covering and the Levites bearing the Ark,—as the Law enjoined, as they are said to have done throughout the long marches in the wilderness, and as they surely would have done if they had really been present,—we read that the Ark was put upon a 'new cart,' and—

'Uzzah and Ahio, the sons of Abinadab, drave the new cart . . . and *Ahio went before the Ark*,' *v.*3,4—

while Uzzah evidently walked behind or beside it, and so put out his hand to stay it, *v.*6. Not a word is said about Priests or Levites in the whole narrative.

259. If, however, we now turn to the *Chronicler's* report of the very same transaction, we perceive at once a wonderful difference. Here the Priest and Levite occupy the most prominent place, and fill the whole foreground of the picture, appearing everywhere in great force and activity, and yet in such a way as to throw complete discredit upon the whole account. Thus we are first told that, among those who 'came to David to Hebron to turn the kingdom of Saul to him,' there were 4,600 *Levites* and 3,700 *Priests*—

'and with them Zadok, a young man mighty of valour, and of his father's house twenty-and-two captains,' 1Ch.xii.26–28.

Then we read that David consulted with the 'captains of thousands and hundreds and with every leader,'—with Zadok, therefore, and his 'twenty-two captains' of the 'sons of Aaron' among the rest—about the matter of bringing up the Ark, and gathered 'all Israel together' for the purpose, *v.*5; including, we must suppose, above all others these 8,300 'Priests and Levites,' or some large proportion of them. Nay, they were expressly to be summoned on the occasion:—

'And David said unto all the congregation of Israel, If it seem good unto you, and that it be of Jehovah our God, let us send abroad unto our brethren everywhere that are left in all the land of Israel, and with them also to the *Priests and*

*Levites* which are in their cities and suburbs, that they may gather themselves unto us; and let us bring again the Ark of our God to us.' 1Ch.xiii.2.

260. And yet, *even according to the Chronicler*, after all this consultation and gathering, David makes use of *laymen alone* to remove the Ark in the first instance! For it is only when warned by the death of Uzzah that David is made to say,—

'None ought to carry the Ark of God but the *Levites*; for them hath Jehovah chosen to carry the Ark of God and to minister unto Him for ever . . . For, because ye did it not at the first, Jehovah our God made a breach upon us, for that we sought Him not after the due order. So the *Priests* and the *Levites* sanctified themselves to bring up the Ark of Jehovah, the God of Israel. And *the children of the Levites bare the Ark of God upon their shoulders with the staves thereon, as Moses commanded according to the word of Jehovah*,' 1Ch.xv.2,13–15.

And the numbers of the 'Priests and Levites,' who attended on the occasion, are carefully registered, *v.*4–12 :—

'And David assembled the children of Aaron and the Levites,—of the sons of Kohath, Uriel the chief, and his brethren, 120,—of the sons of Merari, Asaiah the chief, and his brethren, 220,—of the sons of Gershom, Joel the chief, and his brethren, 130,—of the sons of Elizaphan, Shemaiah the chief, and his brethren, 200,—of the sons of Hebron, Eliel the chief, and his brethren, 80—of the sons of Uzziel, Amminadab the chief, and his brethren, 112.'

261. Thus even on this *second* gathering of the Priests and Levites, when they had been already warned by the death of Uzzah of the sin committed on the first occasion, in employing laymen to move the Ark,—when 'all Israel' had been *again* summoned, xiii.5, xv.3, and the 'sons of Aaron and the Levites' *again* assembled, xiii.2, xv.4, to take their part on this great religious occasion,—only 862 Levites and 2 Priests, xv.11, attended, out of 4,600 Levites and 3,700 Priests who had come to David *ten years before*, 1Ch.xii.23,26,27, for a mere civil object at Hebron! Yet, though he had this immense body of Priests and Levites at his disposal,—or even the smaller body of 2 Priests and 862 Levites—though he had knowledge (as is implied) of their sacred calling, and had summoned them for the express purpose of 'bringing again the Ark of God,'—still,

according to the Chronicler's own admission, David actually employed mere *laymen* to handle the Ark upon the first occasion!

262. The whole story is obviously a mass of contradictions, and the traditionary view of its truthfulness involves the most manifest absurdities. For that view would require us to believe that David, after having made all these preparations with the most sincere desire to do the will of Jehovah,—having the Pentateuch in his hands and its laws written upon his heart, (as surely must have been the case with him, if with any one in that age, supposing the Pentateuch to have been really at the time existing,)—nay, having actually copied it out with his own hand, D.xvii.18, as David, especially after Samuel's teaching, must surely have done, if any of the kings of Israel did,—yet wholly neglected to make the proper use of the Levites, according to the express directions laid down in the Sacred Books! What? Can it be supposed that, if he *did* forget them,—we assume that he did not *wilfully set them aside*—yet *they*, the Priests and Levites who were present, would never have reminded him of the dire consequences that must be expected to follow from such a neglect?

263. Yet those Priests and Levites, it is supposed on the traditionary view, had all along been filling their sacred office,—for in 1S.vi.15, as we have seen, 'the Levites took down the Ark,' and a due regard for sacred things had been enforced by the terrible judgment upon the men of Bethshemesh, of whom '50,070 men'* were struck dead, because they ventured to look

* The largeness of the number here is not really more astonishing than in a multitude of other similar instances, *e.g.* the 600,000 warriors who came out of Egypt. But translators and commentators have realized to themselves more distinctly the difficulty here; while they look at the other instance, of far more vital importance to the whole story, in a dreamy kind of way, and do not allow themselves to consider the practical absurdities and impossibilities, which of necessity it entails with it. Thus, while the Heb., LXX, *Vulg.* and *Targ. Jon.* has 50,070, the *Syr.* and *Arab.* have 5,070, and Josephus *Ant.* VI.i.4, has only 70. The reason given for their being killed is also curiously modified: the *Vulg.* has

into the Ark! Is it credible, then, or even conceivable, that, out of so many hundreds or even thousands of the tribe of Levi, who were present and looking on, not one single Priest or Levite came forward to warn the pious king, that no man of any other tribe whatever should presume to intrude upon *their* sacred prerogative, 'lest he die,'—nay, rather, lest there should break forth 'a plague among the children of Israel,' N.viii.19? Was it *David* above all men,—who had the prophets, Samuel, Nathan, and Gad, to advise him, two of whom were then living and doubtless by his side,—*David*, who in this part of his life, at all events, desired above all things to do what was right and 'according to God's own heart,'—that needed to be taught by the death of Uzzah, to pay due reverence to the holy Ark, and learned first in this painful way to say,—

'None ought to carry the Ark of God but the Levites'?

264. It is surely idle to say with Bishop PATRICK—

They had so long been without the Ark that they had forgot how it ought to be carried.

Were David, then, and the Priests and Levites and Prophets of his time in total ignorance of the very existence of the Mosaic Law? Or were they so entirely neglectful of it, that they never once thought of consulting it on such an occasion? Or had the catastrophe of Bethshemesh in the days of their fathers or grandfathers disappeared altogether from the recollections of the people? Mr. SCOTT's comment is as follows:—

It appears from David's language to the Priests and Levites, that they had before neglected to 'sanctify themselves,' by carefully avoiding, or seeking to be

---

'eò quod vidissent arcam Domini,' *Targ. Jon.* 'super quod gavisi sunt, quod viderunt arcam Domini, quando apparuit,' the *Syr.* (Walton) 'eò quòd extimuerint arcam Domini,' the *Arab.* (Walton) 'eò quòd parvi pendissent arcam Domini, et timuerint introducere eam in domus suas,' while the LXX account is stranger than any, Καὶ οὐκ ἠσμένισαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰεχονίου ἐν τοῖς ἀνδράσι Βαιθσαμὺς, ὅτι εἶδον κιβωτὸν Κυρίου, καὶ ἐπάταξεν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἑβδομήκοντα ἄνδρας καὶ πεντήκοντα χιλιάδας ἀνδρῶν, 'and the sons of Jechonias were not pleased with the men of Bethshemesh, because they saw the ark of the Lord, and he slew among them 50,070 men.'

cleansed from, all ceremonial pollutions, by abstraction from outward indulgences, and by repentance, faith, prayer, and meditation. The Ark had been long stationary, and the Priests and Levites, through negligence, had forgotten how it ought to be removed; so that the king himself was the first to discover the error which had been committed, and pointed it out to them; and, though he joined himself with them, as 'not having sought the Lord after due order,' yet it is plain that a large proportion of the blame belonged to them, especially to the chief persons among them. It seems, however, that they were by this time made sensible of their guilt and danger, and very seriously and reverentially prepared for the solemn service. 'The good king doth not wholly excuse himself, and lay all the blame on them; but puts himself into the number of those, who were negligent in this matter. For it was his duty, as well as theirs, to look into the Law, and pray to God for his direction.' Bp. PATRICK. Had the express injunction in the law of Moses, Deut.xvii.18, [that every king on his accession should make for himself a copy of the Law,] been strictly observed, it would have prevented many of these mistakes. But it may be doubted whether even David himself had noticed it.

*Ans.* If David had read the book of the Law at all, he *must* have 'noticed' *this* command. It is plain, too, that the sin committed, according to the Chronicler, was not merely that the Priests and Levites had not 'sanctified themselves' properly in order to carry the Ark, but that they had not carried it at all.

265. But, if David knew the law of God upon this point *now*, within three months of the death of Uzzah, 1Ch.xiii.14, he must have known it before,—or else *some one* then living must have known it, some Prophet, Priest, or Levite, who, in that great concourse and consultation, 1Ch.xiii.1–6, must have drawn attention to so serious a matter, where any neglect might not only cause the wrath of Jehovah to 'break forth' upon the individual offender, but upon 'the congregation of the children of Israel,' N.i.53. Nay, the death of the Beth-shemites, (if true), whose children and grandchildren were still living, must have already warned them all of this, if it is conceivable that David himself would not have been aware of the Divine command, and, if aware, would not have paid all due regard to it. Accordingly, nothing is said in 2S.vi of any Priests or Levites being concerned in the second expedition for bringing up the Ark any more than the first, though the accident is mentioned, by which Uzzah died,—crushed it may be, in some way,—perhaps, knocked down under the wheels of the

vehicle,—while attempting to support the Ark with his hand, when at some bad part of the road the cart, which carried it, was nearly upset.

266. We cannot but conclude then, that the account given by the Chronicler of the numbers of Priests and Levites in David's days, and of the part which they took on the occasion of bringing-up the Ark, is wholly untrustworthy and, in plain, honest words, untrue,—and owes its existence, in fact, like many other passages in his narrative, to a desire on his part to magnify the office and dignity of the Levites his brethren, and to exhibit as common in those old times a degree of conformity to the Mosaic laws, which, as the more authentic history abundantly teaches us, was not then practised. Thus in 1Ch.xxiii.3–5 he tells us that, when David was 'old and full of days,' the Levites were numbered, 38,000, from the age of thirty years and upwards, of whom 24,000 were to set forward the work of the House of Jehovah, while 6,000 were '*officers and judges*,' 4,000 were 'porters,' and 4,000 also 'musicians.' So that here the Levites are in possession of high honours and offices in the time of David, contrary to the whole letter and spirit of the Book of Samuel, where they are only mentioned on one single occasion of David's life, when they helped Zadok to carry out and carry back the Ark, 2S.xv.24.

267. Here then are twenty-four thousand Levites—that is, we may suppose, 2,000 a month—required for the services of a small Tabernacle, considerably less, we may be sure, than Solomon's Temple, and that temple itself not one-third as large as St. Martin's Church in the Strand, (III.671), so that *five* priests and doorkeepers sufficed for it in the days of Zedekiah, 2K.xxv.18! How was it, we may ask again in astonishment, if there were 38,000 Levites in the land, only 862 were present, according to the Chronicler himself, on the second occasion of bringing up the Ark? But the fictitious nature of all these details is sufficiently evidenced by the fact that whereas the Chapter

begins with taking the lowest age for the Levites' age of service at *thirty* years, as we find it in N.iv.47, (where, probably, we have the rule which prevailed when that Chapter was written,) the writer glides off inadvertently in 1Ch.xxiii.24,27, to *twenty* years, the age at which they were fit for service in *Ezra's* time, Ezr.iii.8, when only 341 above that age returned to Jerusalem.

268. In other places, however, of this Book of Chronicles, written by a Levite, about two centuries after the Captivity (II.236), we find the members of the Levitical body placed regularly in positions of the highest rank or dignity. In 1Ch.xxvi.29 we have Chenaniah and his sons, Levites, appointed—

'in the outward business of Israel, for *officers and judges*.'

In *v.*30, 1,700 of another family of Levites, the 'Hebronites,'—

'were *officers* among them of Israel on this side of Jordan westward, in all the business of Jehovah, and *in the service of the king*.'

In *v.*31,32, among the same Levite family there were—

'2,700 *chief fathers*, whom king David made *rulers* over the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, for every matter pertaining to God and affairs of the king.'

So that we have 2,700 chief fathers and 1,700 officers, out of one single family of the tribe of Levi!! In short, almost all the business of the *State*, as well as of the *Church*, seems, according to the Chronicler, to have been carried on by Levites.

269. The Books of Samuel and Kings say not a word about all these distinctions, but imply by their silence and other plain signs—such as David's neglect of the Ark for ten years of his reign, his neglect of the Levites when he first went to bring it up, &c.,—the direct opposite. If there were really such grand officers as these,—*e.g.* Jerijah, 1Ch.xxvi.31,32, 'chief among the Hebronites,'—chief, therefore, over a body of 4,400 'chief fathers' and 'officers,' employed 'in the king's service,' as well as 'in matters pertaining to God' on both sides of the Jordan,—

how is it that there is not the least reference to these among the chief officers of David and Solomon, 2S.viii.15–18, 1K.iv.1–19? How is it that in these Books also not a word is said about a multitude of similar matters, *e.g.* 2Ch.xvii.7–9,xix.8,xxx.22,27, —in which the Levites appear very prominently in the Chronicler's story? As the writer of the Book of Kings must have had before him all the facts which the Chronicler had in later days, in those common records which, from the absolute identity of their language in so many places, they appear to have consulted, we should have to conclude that he *purposely* omitted every fact of this kind that would do honour to the Levitical institution, if we were obliged to believe that such facts were really known to him.

270. We have, then, every reason to distrust the account which the Chronicler gives us of the genealogy of the Hemanite family of choristers, which he traces up through Samuel to Levi. HENGSTENBERG, indeed, observes, ii.*p.*50—

> A wilful fiction cannot be suspected in these genealogies; since the author, had he been disposed to forge a false succession, would, no doubt, have made Samuel a descendant of Aaron.

But that he could not do. However desirous he might be to connect the family of Samuel with that of Levi,—though this would be very far from remedying all the disorders in Samuel's proceedings, supposing the Pentateuch to have been in his hands,—yet probably he could not venture to represent him as a descendant of Aaron, since then his grandson Heman and his offspring must have been reckoned as priests of the family of Zadok, instead of filling, as they notoriously did, the humbler office of choristers.

271. We may add also, as a further indication of the untrustworthy character of this genealogy, that, while he reckons *ten* generations from Judah to David, 1Ch.ii.4–15, and from Levi downwards *thirteen* to Zadok, in the generation after David, vi.1–8, *thirteen* also to Ethan, vi.44–47, and *fourteen* to

Asaph, *v.*39–43, Zadok's contemporaries, he reckons *twenty-one* from Levi to Heman, also one of the same age, *v.*33–38. 'In other words, allowing thirty years for an average generation, 'Heman, Samuel's grandson, instead of being a contemporary with the other two choir-leaders of David's time, would have been separated from them by more than *two centuries*.

272. We agree, therefore, as we have said, with KUENEN and other eminent critics, in the belief that Elkanah, Samuel's father was an *Ephraimite*, and consequently that Samuel was not a man of the tribe of Levi, notwithstanding the Chronicler's assertion to the contrary. But, even if he was a Levite—and then in his single person the tribe would have had an honourable representative in the age of Saul,—yet the evidence would still remain, which we have drawn from the Scripture history, as to the insignificant position of the Levites generally, until the middle part, at least, of the time of David, —*viz.* the *positive* evidence of the two episodes in the Book of Judges, and the *negative* testimony derived from the silence of the Books of Samuel as to their activity even in connection with the great event of the removal of the Ark to Jerusalem. They are not even mentioned, as we have said, in Ps.lx and Ps.lxviii, both (as we believe) Psalms of this very age. Nor is there the least allusion to Levites in the account of the proceedings at the Tabernacle in Eli's days, in 1S.i,ii,iii,—in which narrative there are other marvellous phenomena, if sought to be explained on the traditionary view,—as we have partly seen already (252), and shall yet see more fully in a future Part of this work, when the whole question of the origin and history of the Priesthood in Israel will be considered.

273. Out of this insignificant tribe, then, 'portioned-out in Jacob and scattered in Israel,' David seems to have taken a certain number to serve as assistants to the two Priests, whom he had appointed to preside over the new-built Tabernacle.

The Chronicler, indeed, says that Zadok was stationed, with 'his brethren the priests,'—

'Before the Tabernacle of Jehovah in the high-place that was at Gibeon, to offer burnt-offerings unto Jehovah upon the Altar of burnt-offering continually, *and to do according to all that is written in the Law of Jehovah, which He commanded Israel.*' 1Ch.xvi.39,40.

And we must suppose, though he does not mention it, that while Zadok had the care of the *Tabernacle of Moses* at Gibeon, Abiathar was left in charge of the *Tabernacle of David* at Jerusalem. The above statement, however, is probably intended to screen Solomon from the charge of having sacrificed on the *ordinary* 'high-places,' though we find in 1K.iii.3,4, that he actually did this:—

'And Solomon loved Jehovah, walking in the statutes of David his father: only he sacrificed and burnt incense on the high-places. And the king went to Gibeon to sacrifice there; for that was the great high-place: a thousand burnt-offerings did Solomon offer upon that altar.'

274. But the Chronicler says nothing about David's great sins of adultery and murder, and never hints at Solomon's idolatries. So, too, he makes Asa—

'*take-away the high-places* out of all the cities of Judah,' 2Ch.xiv.3,5,—

whereas in the older history we are expressly told—

'but the high-places were *not* taken-away; nevertheless Asa's heart was perfect with Jehovah all his days,' 1K.xv.14.

And this datum (strange to say) the Chronicler himself copies, though he adds a significant modification—

'but the high-places were not taken-away *out of Israel*,—[with *Israel*, however, Asa, as King of Judah, had nothing to do]; nevertheless Asa's heart was perfect all his days,' 2Ch.xv.17.

He does the same with Jehoshaphat, of whom he writes—

'his heart was lifted-up in the ways of Jehovah; moreover *he took away the high-places* and asheras out of Judah,' 2Ch.xvii.6;

yet the older writer says that in Jehoshaphat's reign—

'the high-places were *not* taken away; the people sacrificed and burnt incense still in the high-places,' 1K.xxii.43.

And the Chronicler copies *this* notice also, in direct contradiction to his own previous statement, and this time without the addition of the words 'out of Israel'—

'howbeit the high-places were not taken away; for as yet the people had not prepared their hearts unto the God of their fathers,' 2Ch.xx.33.

275. In all these instances, the purpose of the Chronicler is clear, to screen these kings, whom he regarded as pious kings, from any participation in the sin of the 'high-places'; and we see thus, in another series of instances, how entirely untrustworthy his statements frequently are, when not supported by other authority.* He has manifestly wished to protect Solomon also from a similar imputation. And therefore, whereas the older story says plainly, as we have seen, that 'he sacrificed, and burnt incense in the high-places,' and expressly that he 'offered 1,000 burnt-offerings upon the altar' at the 'great high-place' of Gibeon, the Chronicler modifies the statement thus, 2Ch.i.3–6:—

'And Solomon and all the congregation with him, went to the high-place that was at Gibeon; for there was the Tabernacle of the Congregation of God, which Moses the servant of Jehovah had made in the wilderness. But the Ark of God had David brought up from Kirjath-Jearim to the place which David had prepared for it; for he had pitched a Tabernacle for it at Jerusalem. Moreover, *the Brazen Altar, that Bezaleel, the son of Uri, the son of Hur, had made, was there before the Tabernacle of Jehovah*; and Solomon and the Congregation sought unto it. And *Solomon went up thither to the Brazen Altar before Jehovah*, which was at the Tabernacle of the Congregation, and *offered a thousand burnt-offerings upon it.*'

276. Here, then, we have Solomon represented, not as 'offering in the high-places,' generally, but merely going-up to the 'great high-place' at Gibeon—great, not because of its being the favourite resort of the people, (as we should perhaps gather from 1K.iii.4,) but because (says the Chronicler) the

* These corruptions of the older narrative,—for they can be called by no milder name,—which occur so frequently in the Books of Chronicles, have done much—perhaps, more than any one other single cause—to confuse our ideas about the true course of the History of Israel.

Mosaic Tabernacle was there, and above all the 'Brazen Altar before the Tabernacle,' on which only was it lawful to offer, according to the Mosaic Law, Jo.xxii.19,29; so that the young king in offering 1,000 burnt-offerings 'upon that altar' at Gibeon, 1K.iii.4, was only showing his pious obedience to the Law. Not a word is said by the Chronicler about his offering on *other* high-places,—much less about his—

'*building high-places* on the hill that is before Jerusalem, for Chemosh the abomination of Moab, and for Molech the abomination of Ammon,' 1K.xi.7.

277. But here, as so often elsewhere, the Chronicler's own statements confute one another, as we have fully shown in (III. 836). And, as Zadok and Abiathar are always found together at Jerusalem in the more authentic history, 2S.xv.24–29,xvii.15, xix.11,1K.i.7,8, there seems little reason to doubt that they were both stationed at the Tabernacle, and apparently they were the *only* priests who ministered there. To help them, however, in the lower offices of the Sanctuary, David seems to have appointed certain of the poor, despised tribe of Levi. Like the Simeonites, the Levites had no lands, no homes, no regular occupations; and they were therefore in a very fitting condition to be taken for this work. It is probable that only a few such Levites were thus actually employed by David's orders, in proportion to the small number of the priests, and the small size of the Tabernacle.

278. But the office itself would confer some dignity not only on those individuals who ministered, but on the whole body of the tribe from which they were taken. And gradually that dignity would be increased, and the connection of the tribe with sacred things be more fully recognised. In Solomon's time, probably, more were required; and he seems also to have relieved the Levites from the more menial offices, by appointing an inferior class of attendants, who are spoken of as 'Solomon's servants,' and as 'Nethinim,' Ezr.ii.58, though the latter may even have originated in the time of David. In later days, the

name 'Levite,' as we have seen in Part III, became synonymous with 'Priest,' and the 'Priests' themselves are classed as 'chief Priests,' 'Priests of the second order,' and 'doorkeepers.'

279. Without at present going more deeply into the question of the rise and progress of the Levitical Priesthood in Israel, the above seems to give a substantially true account of the circumstances under which the Levites became first distinguished, as specially set apart for sacred offices. And we have seen already that the 'Blessing of Jacob,' if we look only at the words addressed to *Joseph*, must have been written, it would seem, before the death of Solomon and the rupture of the kingdom, but *might* have been written, with the greatest propriety, during the early years of David's reign, by a man of Ephraim attached to the royal house of Judah. So, too, if we regard those addressed to *Judah*, it must have been written when Judah's brothers had 'bowed down' before him, *after* the removal from Hebron to Jerusalem, about the *eighth* year of his reign, 2S.v.5, but *before* the detection of his sin with Bathsheba, 2S.xii.7, about the *twenty-first* year of his reign.

280. And now the language addressed to Levi compels us to fix the date of its composition *before* the time when the Levites acquired some respect by their connection with the service of the Tabernacle; and they *may* have been connected with it from the time when David brought up the Ark to Jerusalem, about the *fourteenth* year of his reign, 2S.vi. Upon the whole, therefore, we shall probably not be far from the truth in supposing that the 'Blessing of Jacob' was written by an Ephraimite Prophet, attached to the Court of David, about the *twelfth* year of David's reign, when the exultation was yet fresh on account of the victories which David had gained over the Jebusites and Philistines, as described in 2S.v.6–25, when Ephraim had cheerfully accepted the sovereignty of David, 2S.v.1–3,—and when Levi was not yet marked out as the future sacred tribe in Israel.

## CHAPTER XVI.

SUMMARY OF THE PRECEDING CONCLUSIONS AS TO THE AGES OF THE DIFFERENT WRITERS OF GENESIS.

281. We have now seen reason to fix the age of the *Elohist* in the latter part of the reign of Saul.

And we have shown that the *Jehovist* must have written at different times, from the early part of David's reign to the early part of Solomon's, and that he appears to have written the 'Blessing of Jacob,' xlix.1$^{b}$–28, somewhere about the *twelfth* year of David's reign.

With respect to the *Second Elohist*, there has seemed to us to be good ground for supposing that he was no other than the Jehovist at an earlier period of his labours. But he may, of course, have been some other writer of that age, who made the *first* additions to the Elohistic story.

282. The *Second Jehovist* speaks of 'Salem,' xiv.18, that is, most probably, Jerusalem, and of the 'valley of Shaveh,' which was known in later days—as the editorial note informs us, xiv.17—as the 'king's dale,' and so it is called in the history of the latter part of David's life, 2S.xviii.18. This Chapter, then, appears to have been written some time after the first eight years of David's reign, when he had taken possession of Jebus, and called it Jerusalem, 2S.v.6–9, and had connected himself in some way with the 'valley of Shaveh,' so that it acquired the name of 'the king's dale.' Further, in the familiar mention of *Damascus*, xiv.15, we may have a sign that David's conquests had reached in that direction, 2S.viii.5,6, and that the planting of

his garrisons there had made the place better known to the men of Judah.

283. Again, the fact, that out of the spoil of the confederate kings Abram 'gave tithes of all' to Melchizedek, the 'priest of God Most High' at Salem, may have been recorded as an example for David to follow in respect of *his* spoils—giving 'tithes of all' to Zadok and Abiathar, the Priests of Jehovah at Jerusalem. Or, still more probably, it may have been written in memory and commendation of David's own voluntary act—like that of Abram—in 'dedicating to Jehovah'—we may suppose for the future building of the Temple in his son's days—the vessels of silver, gold, and brass, which were sent to him by the king of Hamath—

'with the silver and gold that he had dedicated of all nations which he had subdued, of Syria, and Moab, and of the children of Ammon, and of the Philistines, and of Amalek, and of the spoil of Hadadezer, son of Rehob, king of Zobah,' 2S.viii.9–12.

If this conjecture be correct, it would fix the date of the composition of this Chapter, G.xiv, about the *sixteenth* or *eighteenth* year of David's reign; and we might suppose it to have been written by some companion and friend of the Jehovist, and adopted by him into his narrative.

284. If we wish to fix on any individuals, as *possible* writers of the respective documents, we might name SAMUEL, NATHAN, and GAD, who lived at the times in question, and, if any weight is to be attached to the Chronicler's statement, 1Ch.xxix.29, were known in the traditions of the people as writers of history. And, though we do not lay any stress whatever on this point, we may use these names as the names of representative and leading men of those ages. SAMUEL died at Ramah, we are told, 1S. xxv.1, about three or four years (as the chronology is usually reckoned) before the death of Saul. NATHAN is first mentioned —but then as already established as a prophet of Jehovah about the Court of David,—in 2S.vii.2, about the *fourteenth* year of

David's reign; and he was still alive and actively concerned on behalf of Solomon in the first year of that king's reign, 1K.i.8, &c., and two of his sons were among Solomon's chief counsellors, 1K.iv.5. GAD 'the prophet, David's Seer,' was living in the last years of David, 2S.xxiv.11, &c.

285. We may arrange the above results in a tabular form as follows, giving the dates according to the usual Scripture chronology:—

| | B.C. | Contemp. Prophet |
|---|---|---|
| *Elohist* | 1100–1060 | SAMUEL |
| *Second Elohist* / *Jehovist* | 1060–1010 | NATHAN |
| *Second Jehovist* | 1035 | GAD |
| *Deuteronomist* | 641–624 | JEREMIAH (III.867) |

Once more, we repeat, we do not by any means maintain that the Prophets above-named were actually the writers of the corresponding sections of Genesis. But *some great and good men*—as great and good as these—leading men of the respective ages—must have written them. And we may use the above names in order to fix our ideas, as those of the representative men of these ages,—nay, the first three as the only names which have come down to us of men who would have been likely to have been engaged in these labours,—for no other writers of history out of those ages are named in the Bible.

286. Lastly, the evidence before us seems to point to the conclusion, that the later writers did *not* write their own independent narratives, but merely supplemented the original brief Elohistic document, which had been laid as the groundwork of the whole Pentateuchal story. We might, for instance, represent to ourselves the matter somewhat as follows, as already in part suggested in (II.342). We might suppose that Samuel, having himself acquired from the Phœnicians the knowledge of the art of cursive writing, which appears to have originated with them, may have turned his attention to the improvement of the people by establishing a 'School of Prophets,' in which young

men of his choice might be trained, who might afterwards assist in training and teaching the people. For such 'schools' as these, we find, did exist in later days, 1K.xx.35, 2K.ii.3,5, &c. iv.1,38, v.22, vi.1, ix.1; and we have plain intimation of something of the kind in Samuel's time, and under his *charge*, in 1S.x.5,10,11,12, and especially in xix.20, where we read—

'And Saul sent messengers to take David; and, when they saw the company of the prophets *prophesying*, and Samuel standing as appointed over them, the spirit of Elohim was upon the messengers of Saul, and they also *prophesied*.'

287. By '*prophesy*' in the above is, no doubt, meant 'singing' or 'chanting,' since we read in 1Ch.xxv.1 that David set apart as singers—

'of the sons of Asaph and of Heman and of Jeduthun, who should *prophesy* with harps, with psalteries, and with cymbals.'

And it would seem from the preceding notice (286) that Samuel taught his youths to chant, and, if so, they must have had psalms to chant. We may infer, then, that metrical odes of some kind were *composed*—and why not also *written*?—in this age—of which very possibly some may even be retained in the Psalter (II.438). We have instances of this in David's dirge, 2S.i.19-27, which has all the appearance of being genuine, and shows a high finish, as if such compositions were by this time not uncommon in Israel. But, if so, then it is not at all improbable that prose narratives also were written, and that the first attempts had already been made to sketch out the early history of Israel.

288. If Samuel made this beginning, by composing the Elohistic story, he may have left it unfinished in the hands of his disciples Nathan and Gad, whom we may fairly suppose to have been trained under his auspices. He may have given them a charge to finish it, or their own hearts may have moved them to do so. Perhaps, under his instructions, or after his example, they may have been already occupied in writing the 'Book of Jasher,' the 'Book of the Wars of Jehovah,' and some of the older

portions of the Book of Judges. But now, after Samuel's death, the Jehovist (Nathan, suppose) deliberately completes to the best of his power the work of the Elohist, introducing also a passage, xiv, from the hand of some fellow-labourer (as Gad).

289. *How much* of the whole Pentateuch belongs to the Elohist and Jehovist respectively we cannot, of course, say; until the other Books have been submitted to the same searching criticism, as has been applied by HUPFELD and BOEHMER—and by ourselves, to the best of our ability—to Genesis. But a cursory glance at the contents of these Books is sufficient to show that there is but little in either of them, which can by any possibility be ascribed to the Elohist. *Other* writers besides these may, as far as we know at present, have been concerned in the composition of these Books. But, at length, in Josiah's reign, as we have seen reason (in III) to believe, the Tetrateuch, in the form which it had then taken, including of course the Book of Genesis, was first revised and retouched by some great prophetical writer, and enlarged with the addition of almost the whole present Book of Deuteronomy.

290. We come back now again to the consideration of a very important question, which has already been stated in (84,85).

It has appeared to us that the Second Elohist and Jehovist are really one and the same person; and that many critical difficulties will be removed by supposing that this writer made additions to the original work of the Elohist at different intervals, during a period of from forty to fifty years (according to the ordinary reckoning) from the last years of Saul to the first years of Solomon.

291. We might suppose, for instance, that the additions to the original Elohistic narrative may have been made in the order indicated below, where we use $J^1(=E_2)$, $J^2$, $J^3$, &c., to represent the *Jehovist* (J) in the different *stages* of his work, and D the *Later Editor* or *Deuteronomist.*

E,—i.1–31, ii.1–4[a], v.1–28,30–32, vi.9–14,17–22, vii.6–9,11,13–16[a],18[a],19[b],21, 22,23[b],24, viii.1,2[a],3[b],4[b],5,13[a],14–19, ix.1–17,28,29, xi.10–27,31,32, xii.4[b],5, xiii.6, 12[a], xvi.1,3,15,16, xvii.1–27, xix.29, xxi.2–5, xxiii.1–20, xxv. 7–11[a],12–17,19,20,21[b], 24–26, xxvi.34,35, xxviii.1–9, xxix.24,29,32[ab],33[ad],34[a],35[ad], xxx.1[a],4[a],5,6[a],7,8[ac],9–13, 17,18[ac],19,20[ac],21–24[a], xxxi.18, xxxv.9–15,16[a],19,20[a],22[b]–29, xxxvi.1–19,31–35[abd], 36–43, xxxvii.1,2[a],28[a],36, xlvi.6–12[a],13–20[ac],21–26[abd],27, xlvii.7–11[abd],27[b],28, xlviii. 3–7, xlix.1[a],28[b]–33, l.13,—*age of Samuel*, 336 verses.

J[1],—xx.1–17, xxi.8–20,22–27[a],32, xxvi.18, xl.2,3[a],4,5[a],6–23, xli.1–30,32–34, 36–39,44,45,47,56,57, xlii.5,6[a],7[a], xlv.16–18,21[a],—*latter part of Saul's reign*, 106 verses.

J[2],—xxi.6,7,21,27[b]–31,33,34, xxii.1–13,19, xxviii.10–22, xxix.1–23,25–28,30, xxx.25–27[a],31–42, xxxi.2,4–17,19–48[a],50–55, xxxii.1,2,13[a],22[ac],24[b]–32,xxxiii.18–20, xxxiv.1–31, xxxv.5,6,20[b],21,22[a], xxxvii.2[b]–27,28[b]–35, xli.31,35,40–43,46,48–55, xlii.1–4,6[b],7[b]–38,xliii.1–34,xliv.1–34, xlv.1–15,19,20,21[b]–28, xlvi.1–5,20[b],26[c],28–34, xlvii.1–6,11[c],12–27[a],29–31,xlviii.1,2,8–22,xlix.1[b]–28[a],l.1–12,14–26,—*second decade of David's reign*, 462 verses.

J[3],—ii.4[b]–iv.26, v.29, vi.1–3,5–8,15,16, vii.1–5,10,12,16[b],17,18[b],19[a],20,23[a], viii. 2[b],3[a],4[ac],6–12,13[b],20–22, ix.18–27, xi.1–9, xii.1–4[a],6–8, xiii.7–11,12[b]–18, [$J_2$(xiv. 1–24)], xviii.1–17,20–33, xix.1–28,30–38, xx.18, xxi.1, xxv.21[a],22,23, xxxviii.1–30, xxxix.1–23, xl.1,3[b],5[b], xlvi.12[b],—*latter part of David's reign*, 269 verses ($J^3$) + 24 verses ($J_2$).

J[4],—x.1–7,13–32, xi.28–30, xii.9–20, xiii.1–5, xvi.2,4–14, xxii.20–24, xxiv.1–58, 61–67, xxv.1–6,11[b],18,27–34, xxvi.1–3,6–17,19–33, xxvii.1–46, xxix.31,32[cd],33[bc], 34[bcd],35[bc], xxx.1[b],2,3,4[b],6[b],8[b],14–16,18[b],20[b],24[b],27[b]–30,43, xxxi.1,3,48[b],49, xxxii. 3–12,13[b]–21,22[b],23,24[a],xxxiii.1–17,xxxv.1–4,7,16[b]–18,xxxvi.20–30,35[c],—*beginning of Solomon's reign*, 297 verses.

D,—vi.4, x.8–12, xv.1–21, xviii.18,19, xxii.14–18, xxiv.59,60, xxvi.4,5, xxxv.8, with explanatory notes in xiv.2,3,7,8,17, xxiii.2,19, xxxv.6,19, xxxvi.43, xlviii.7,—*early part of Josiah's reign*, 39 verses.

292. I believe it will be found that the above scheme satisfies all the conditions of the case. But there is still one point which requires more particular notice. I have supposed that the passages, marked J[4], were inserted *last* by J for the following reasons. It seems, as we have said, to be incredible that *two* such transactions, as those described in xii.10–20,xx.1–17, —precisely similar, but the second altogether improbable on account of Sarah's age, and much more discreditable to the patriarch, considering his wife's condition and his own former experience,—should have been meant to be ascribed to Abraham, and a third of the very same kind to Isaac, xxvi.6–11.

293. Let us, suppose, however, that $E_2$ (whether the Jehovist himself, as we suppose, at an earlier time, or, as HUPFELD and BOEHMER hold, a different writer) had first composed the story in xx.1–17, with the following narrative in xxi.8–20,22–27[a],32, which are at present filled up with the Jehovistic insertions, xx.18, xxi.1,6,7,21,27[b]–31,33,34. It might now occur to J, or it might have been suggested to him by some adviser, that this story of Abraham's conduct was most unsuitable to this part of his life, when Sarah was herself an old woman, above 90, and yet miraculously enceinte with Isaac. It might also seem undesirable to allow the patriarch to lie subject to the blame of having so selfishly exposed his wife and his unborn child to danger under such circumstances. At the same time, it may have been observed that but little had been told about *Isaac*. His marriage, the birth of his children, his charge to Jacob, his death and burial, had been briefly mentioned, and that was all which E had said about him. $E_2$ had added the statement in xxvi.18, that he redûg the wells which his father had dug, and called them by the same names, with a special view, as we suppose, to Beersheba, already mentioned in xxi.32; and $J^4$ had added the blessing upon Jacob and Esau, xxvii.1–46, which belongs, however, rather to the life of Jacob.

294. The Jehovist then, as we suppose, may have thought it best to *cancel* the whole of the insertions in these two Chapters, xx,xxi, (except xxi.6,7, and the short link, xxi.1, which was still needed, in consequence of his own long interpolation in xviii, xix, to connect xxi.2 with the previous Elohistic matter in xvii,) and to substitute for the matter contained in them the following.

(i) xii.9-xiii.5, which takes Abraham to *Egypt*, in a much *earlier* part of his life, when Sarah was younger, *i.e.* only *sixty-five*, instead of *ninety*, (*comp.* xvii.17 with xii.4,) and when she was at all events not pregnant with Isaac.

(ii) xvi.2,4–14, which contains an account of Hagar's quarrel with Sarah, and her flight under somewhat milder circumstances than those recorded in xxi.9-20; and here the well is expressly named and described, *v.*7–14, which was only hinted at in xxi.19.

(iii) Since Ishmael now would be born at home, and not sent away, as in xxi.14, a provision is made for his being sent away in xxv.6; and xxv.6 *may* bring with it xxv.1–5; and, *if* xxv.1–6 belongs to $J^1$, it is probable that the other genealogical additions in x.1–7,13–32, xxii.20–24, xxxvi.20–30,35$^c$, may belong to the same set of insertions. But there is nothing in their contents to decide this; and it is possible, of course, that xxv.6, may have been inserted *after* xxv.1–5, and independently of it.

(iv) xxvi.1–3,6–11, which describes Isaac's conduct at the court of *Abimelech*, (who is now at the Jehovist's disposal, since Abram has been taken to *Pharaoh's* court,) and adds another feature to the account of his life.

(v) xxvi.12–17, which appears to be intended to lead on the story to *v.*18, and *v.*19–22, which seems to have been suggested by the statement in *v.*18, about Isaac's digging wells and naming them.

(vi) xxvi.23–33, which is the substitute for xxi.25–34, fixing Isaac at Beersheba, and deriving its name from *his* transaction with Abimelech, instead of Abraham's.

(vii) xxiv.1–58,61–67 and xxv.11$^b$, which we assign to this part of the Jehovist's work, because they make mention of the well 'Lakhai-roi,' xxiv.62, xxv.11$^b$, and this is first named in xvi.14.

295. By the above supposition we get rid at once of the difficulties in (57) numbered (i), (v), (vi), (vii), (viii); so (ii), (iii), (iv), are explained when we know that G.xv is due to D, and G.xiv to $J_2$; and (ix), (x), (xi), (xii), will be found to arise from later insertions not agreeing exactly with the older notices. It may be objected that in xxii.19 the Jehovist names 'Beersheba,' which is intelligible after the name has been derived in xxi.32, but not if the name was not supposed to be given till after Abraham's death by Isaac. But J uses Bethel proleptically in xii.8,xiii.3, long before it was supposed to have been named; and so Beersheba is similarly used in xxi.14.

296. A similar explanation may be applied to account for the fact, that we have also double derivations of the names 'Bethel,' xxxv.15 (E), xxviii.19 (J), and 'Israel,' xxxv.10 (E), xxxii.28 (J). The Elohist had condensed these two points into one short story, xxxv.9–15, containing little beyond a mere repetition of his usual phrases, and scarcely any new incident. The Jehovist determines to separate them in two different narratives, so as to illustrate each more strikingly

by some prominent event in Jacob's life. He first records a Divine vision, with a cheering promise, as vouchsafed to Jacob on his *starting* for Charran, xxviii.10–22, and upon this occasion he derives the name 'Bethel.' Then again, on his *return* from Charran, after having surmounted all dangers and difficulties, he represents him as being favoured with another remarkable vision,—the form of it probably suggested by the name Jabbok, (יַבֹּק), as if derived from אָבַק, 'wrestle,'—in which he is recognised by Divine authority as one who had 'prevailed as a prince with God and with man.'

297. It will be seen also that we assign to this portion of the Jehovist's work ($J^2$), xxxii.13$^a$,22$^{ac}$,24$^b$–32,—in justification of which we observe as follows.

(i) *v.*13$^a$, 'and he spent-the-night there in that night,' is clearly out of its proper place in the present connection; and the same datum, in fact, is afterwards repeated in *v.*21. Originally, as we suppose, *v.*13$^a$ followed *v.*1,2, as part of the narrative of $J^2$; *comp.* 'and he spent-the-night there,' xxviii.11($J^2$).

(ii) *v.*22$^{ac}$, 'and he arose in that night . . . and passed over the ford Jabbok,' may be compared with xxxi.21($J^2$), 'and he arose and passed-over the river'; *comp.* also 'and he arose' in $J^1$ or $J^2$(xxi.32, xxii. 3,19, xxxi.17, xliii.15, xlvi.5).

(iii) *v.*13$^b$–21 is due to $J^4$, continuing the story of Jacob's dread of Esau, and repeating awkwardly, *v.*21$^a$, the statement already made by $J^2$ in *v.*13$^a$.

(iv) *v.*22$^b$, 'and he took his two wives, and his two maids, and his eleven boys,' belongs evidently to the same set of passages as xxxiii.1, 'and he divided the boys with Leah and with Rachel and with the two maids': and *comp.* יְלָדִים throughout, xxxii.22$^b$(23$^b$), xxxiii.1,2,2,5,5,6,7,14. The expression 'eleven boys,' as well as the notices in xxx.24$^b$, xxxiii.2,7, refers evidently to the fact that *this* writer has recorded in xxxv.16$^b$–18($J^2$) the birth of Benjamin, as taking place at a later date in the history of Jacob than the present passage, for which also he had prepared by the notice, 'after Rachel had borne Joseph,' in xxx.25($J^2$); see *Anal.*255$^{(7)}$.

(v) *v.*23,24$^a$, belongs also to the later recension ($J^4$), which accounts for the awkwardness observed in (*Anal.*237), arising from the fact that in *v.*22 we read, as it now stands, 'he took his wives and his two maids, and his eleven boys, and passed-over the ford Jabbok,' and then it follows afterwards in *v.*23, 'and he took them, and passed-them-over the stream, &c.'

BOEHMER, as we have seen (*Anal.* 236,237), though writing from a very different point of view, has concluded to assign

$v.13^a,22^{ac}$, $24^b,26-31^a$, to $E_2$,' which does not differ materially from our own assignment of $v.13^a,22^{ac}$, $24^b-32$, to $J^2$.

298. The Jehovist, having thus provided in ($J^2$) for the derivation of the two names 'Bethel' and 'Israel,' by means of two striking incidents, may have intended to cancel altogether the Elohistic passage xxxv.9–15, and with it also the Elohistic section, xlviii.3–7, which makes direct reference to it. This view seems to be rather confirmed by the fact that xlviii.8 manifestly ought to have followed immediately after xlviii.2; so that xlviii.1,2,8–22, must have been composed as a continuous story, intended, it would seem, to supply the place of the Elohistic section, *v.*3–7, which was meant to have been cancelled; and in fact it records the two main points of that section, *viz.* the last words of Jacob to Joseph, and the adoption of Ephraim and Manasseh among the tribes of Israel. But if xxxv.9–15 was cancelled, *v.*6 would be needed in ($J^2$) to prepare for *v.*16; and accordingly we have assigned xxxv.5,6, to $J^2$.

299. In both the above instances, however, the older passages have been still retained in the text, *viz.* xx.1–18,xxi.8–34, and xxxv.9–15,xlviii.3–7, through some accident, which cannot now be fully explained. Perhaps, as suggested in *Anal.*(175), the Jehovist may have left the older matter standing in these cases, side by side with his own improvements of the story, either from a reluctance absolutely to destroy it, or with the purpose of submitting the subject to still further consideration. And so it has come to pass that a later Editor has thought it best to retain the whole.

300. It appears, then, that the portions of Genesis, which betray throughout the style of the Jehovist, comprise altogether 1,134 verses (68), and that these may be divided into four distinct sets of passages, written, it would seem, at different ages.

We may tabulate the whole series of Elohistic and Jehovistic passages as follows:—

E, in the days of Samuel, 336 verses;
$J^1$, in the latter part of Saul's reign, 106 verses;
$J^2$, in the second decade of David's reign, 462 verses;
$J^3$, in the latter part of David's reign, 269 verses;
$J^4$, in the beginning of Solomon's reign, 297 verses.

The reader may be reminded that the above separation has been made without any reference whatever to the use of the Divine Name,—*viz.* to the more or less free employment of the Name 'Jehovah,'—but has been established by perfectly independent reasoning.

301. Thus the first series of Jehovistic passages, $J^1$ (or $E_2$), does not indeed contain any decisive marks of time. But these passages are recognised by HUPFELD and BOEHMER as being some of the *earliest* additions to the original Elohistic narrative. These critics, it is true, ascribe *more* matter to their Second Elohist, than we do to $J^1$; and they do not regard him as identical with the Jehovist, or as a mere supplementer of the Elohistic story, but consider him to have been an independent writer. However, *in* the matter which they assign to the Second Elohist, they include (generally) all the sections which we give to $J^1$, and they allow these to be of earlier date than any of their purely *Jehovistic* matter. But some of this last must be assigned, as we have seen, to the *early part of David's reign.* And the *Elohist*, according to BOEHMER himself, wrote as late as *the first seven years* of David's reign (134). We, however, carry the date of it a few years earlier,—to the time of Samuel. And we are therefore justified in assigning $J^1$ to *the latter part of Saul's reign*—which agrees with the conclusion in (164) with respect to xxi.14,32.

302. Again, many of the passages in $J^2$ are ascribed by HUPFELD and BOEHMER to their Second Elohist, and therefore are probably of not much later date than that which we have just determined for $J^1$. And, in fact, *about the twelfth year of David's reign* is distinctly indicated (276) for xlix.$1^b$–28;

while the contents of xxxii.1,2(187)—xxxiii.19,xxxiv(173)—xxxvii.26,27, xliii.3,14, xliv.18–34, xlvii.12,l.21 (175)—xliii.32, xlvi.34, xlvii.26, l.3 (142)—xxviii.10–22, (167, 169)—xxxi, xlviii.15,16 (167)—xlviii.19 (171)—xlviii.22, l.25 (173)— have been shown to be also compatible with *the early part or middle of David's reign,* to which we have been compelled, by the connecting links of the narrative, to assign all these passages.

It is worthy of notice that the name 'Israel' is only used, as a personal name for Jacob, in *this* set of passages, xxxv.21, 22ª,22ª, xxxvii.3,13, xliii.6,8,11, xlv.28, xlvi.1,2,29,30, xlvii.27ª, 29,31, xlviii.2,8,10,11,13,13,14,21, xlix.2, l.2. It seems almost as if the very idea of Israel, as a people 'wrestling' with difficulties and triumphing as a prince with God and men, xxxii.28, had developed itself in these early years of David's reign.

303. In J³, xxv.23 belongs to *the latter part of David's reign,* after his conquest of Edom (147); while xix.30–38 belongs evidently to the same age, but *before the very last years* of David (179). In this set of passages we have placed also ii.11–14 (139, 140), iv.21,22 (140), vi.15,16 (143), xxxix. 20 (142), the contents of which have been shown to be compatible with the age thus assigned to them.

In J⁴, x.1–7,13–32 (139), xxxii.3–21, xxxiii.1–17, xxxv.1–4,7, (161) must be assigned to *the early part of Solomon's reign*; and xiii.2, xxiv.22,35,53, xxx.43(140)—xxvi.14(141)—xxvi.8, xxxiii.17(143), have been shown to contain indications of a somewhat late date, such as that which we have ascribed to them.

304. Thus the grounds, upon which we have separated the above passages, are independent of any theory as to the later introduction of the name 'Jehovah' into the religious language of Israel. In fact, to the *last* set of these passages,—written in *the early part of Solomon's reign,*—has been assigned, the section xxxiii.1–17, in which 'Elohim' occurs *thrice* and

'Jehovah' not at all. We have everywhere been guided simply by observing the connection of the different passages, or the signs of date which they appeared to contain. And it is some proof of the general correctness of our arrangement, that those passages, which we have marked as of *later* date, will be found referring frequently to those assigned to an *earlier* time,—that is, $J^1$ to E,—$J^2$ to E or $J^1$,—$J^3$ to E, $J^1$, or $J^2$,—$J^4$ to E, $J^1$, $J^2$, or $J^3$,—but *not the contrary*.

305. But now, if we proceed to enquire how it stands with the use of the Divine Name in these different sets of passages, we obtain the following result:—

E(E.88,J.0), $J^1$(E.22,J.0), $J^2$(E.67,J.7), $J^3$(E.29,J.89), $J^4$(E.20,J.52).

It is obvious at once that we have here a phenomenon precisely similar to that which we have already observed in the case of the Psalms,—*viz.* that 'Jehovah' becomes more freely used as the age of the writer approaches more and more to the age of Solomon. But a closer inspection of this matter will still further tend to confirm our view on this point.

306. The Elohist, writing *in Samuel's days*, has used, it seems, 'Elohim' exclusively, 88 times, in 336 verses; and even supposing that 'Jehovah' in xvii.1 is due to him, and has not slipped in by an error of transcription, he has never put it into the mouth of any of the Patriarchs, and has clearly meant it to be understood that it was not even known in their days.

But it is further noticeable that he never uses such phrases as 'Elohim of Abraham,' 'Elohim of Isaac,' 'Elohim of Jacob,' &c., though he once has 'I will be their Elohim,' xvii.8, *comp.* E.vi.7, 'I will be to them for Elohim,' 'I am Jehovah your Elohim.' Elsewhere, he employs 'Elohim' always as the Personal Name of God, using 'spirit of Elohim,' i.1, 'prince of Elohim,' xxiii.6, 'wrestlings of Elohim,' xxx.8, but otherwise always Elohim,' or 'ELOHIM' (with the article) v.22,24,vi.9,11, or 'El Shaddai,' xvii.1,xxviii.3,xxxv.11,xlviii.3.

307. So, too, $J^1$, writing in *the last years of Saul*, has likewise used 'Elohim' exclusively, 22 times, in 106 verses. He appears, therefore, to have followed the Elohist's example, maintaining still the idea that the name 'Jehovah' was not at all known to the Patriarchs. He has 'angel of Elohim,' xxi.17, and 'spirit of Elohim,' xli.38; but elsewhere he also uses always 'Elohim' as the Personal Name of God, as also 'ELOHIM,' xx.6,17,xli.25,28,32,32,xlviii.15,15, and EL, xlviii.3.

308. $J^2$, writing *in the second decade of David's reign*, begins to insert 'Jehovah,' and uses it 7 times, in 462 verses. But these seven instances, in which it is employed by him,—*viz.* xxi.33,xxii.11,xxviii.13,13,16,21,xlix.18, exhibit each something remarkable.

As to xxii.11 it is not at all improbable (*Anal.* 136) that the name 'Jehovah' in this verse was originally 'Elohim'; and at any rate it appears very strangely here with 'Elohim' or 'ELOHIM' only in all the rest of the Chapter, *v.*1,3,8,9,12.

So also xlix.18 occurs in so singular a position that it is regarded by BOEHMER, and other eminent critics, as a later interpolation.

In xxi.33, however, the expression is very noticeable,—'he called there on the name of *Jehovah, El Everlasting*,'—as if the writer thought it necessary to explain who 'Jehovah' was—to *translate*, as it were, the meaning of this name (the Living-One) into plainer terms (the Everlasting God)—as if, in short, he was using a name, which was not at the time of his writing very freely employed by devout writers in Israel.

309. In xxviii.13, 'Jehovah' describes Himself, *for the first time*, as we believe, as 'Jehovah, the Elohim of Abraham and the Elohim of Isaac'; Jacob awakes, *v.*16, and cries 'Surely Jehovah is in this place, and I knew it not'; and in *v.*21 he vows that, if 'Elohim'—*i.e. this* 'Elohim'—will protect and bless him, then 'Jehovah shall be his Elohim.'

It seems to us that in the time of this writer, the name 'Jehovah' was beginning to be more freely used; and he can hardly resist the impulse to introduce it into his narrative. Yet he does so very sparingly, as if it were not by any means a familiar Name—in fact, only 7 times in 464 verses, supposing that xxii.11, xlix.18, really belong to him; and the fact of his making Jacob say 'Jehovah shall be *my* Elohim,' seems strongly to support the view, that in this age—the age of David's victories—the age of the 'wrestlings' and 'triumphs' of Israel (302)—the age of the 68th Psalm—the idea was becoming more and more distinctly realised that 'Jehovah' was to be the peculiar name of the 'God of Israel'—

> 'Sing unto Elohim! celebrate His Name!
> In JAH is His Name! so rejoice before Him.'—Ps.lxviii.4.

310. And this seems to be confirmed by the following consideration. While $J^2$ has 'Jehovah' 7 times, he uses 'Elohim' or 'El' 67 times; and among these are 'ELOHIM,' xxii.1,3,9, xlii.18, xliv.16, xlv.8, 'EL,' xlvi.3, 'El Shaddai,' xliii.14, xlix.25; so that these *old* formulæ, which were perhaps employed to denote *the* Supreme Deity, '*the* El,' xlvi.3, (*comp.* '*the* Baal,' *App.*I.32,) before 'Jehovah' was adopted, were still used. He has also, like $J^1$, 'angels of Elohim,' xxviii.12, xxxii.1, 'angel of ELOHIM,' xxxi.11; he uses 'house of Elohim,' xxviii.17,22, 'camp of Elohim,' xxxii.2, 'terror of Elohim,' xxxv.5. But here first it is, in ($J^2$), that we find the formulæ, 'Elohim of Abraham (Isaac, Nahor, Israel),' xxviii.13,13, xxxi.42,53,53, xxxiii.20, 'Elohim of my (thy, your) father,' xxxi.5,29,42,53, xliii.23, xlvi.1,3, xlix.25, l.17. And 'Jehovah,' who is called the 'EL of Beth-El,' xxxi.13, and who watches over Jacob all along in xxxi, becomes at last distinctly 'El, *the Elohim of Israel*,' xxxiii.20

311. In short, it seems as if the idea of a *tutelary Deity* for Israel were being more and more clearly developed under the

influence of the kingdom: so that even Joseph's servant is made to say to the sons of Israel, '*your* Elohim, and the Elohim *of your father*,' xliii.23. In these phrases we seem to have the transition step towards the distinct recognition of the name 'Jehovah' itself, without further definition, as the Name of Jacob's God, the covenant God of Israel.

312. In $J^3$ we find another step taken in the same direction. The name 'Jehovah' has now, *in the latter part of David's reign*, become more freely and popularly used; and the writer determines to introduce it at once in his story from the first, not considering, apparently, or not regarding as of any moment, the contradiction which would thus be imported into the narrative. And, indeed, having already *begun* to employ it, in his previous insertions ($J^2$), perhaps he may have thought it best to do this,—abandoning the Elohistic idea of the origination of the Name in the time of Moses, and representing it as known from the days of the first man downwards. But, in order to guard against any mistake, he pertinaciously couples the two names together, 'Jehovah-Elohim,' in ii.4$^b$–iii.24, *twenty times*, as if desiring to impress strongly upon the reader that the 'Jehovah,' of whom he was about to write, was the same exactly as the 'Elohim' of the older writer.

313. Thus in 269 verses $J^3$ uses 'Elohim' 29 times, and 'Jehovah,' 89 times: or, if we remove the 20 instances, where 'Elohim' is merely inserted to support, as it were, 'Jehovah,'—as also vi.2, 'sons of Elohim,' (for which 'sons of Jehovah' is never used), and ix.26, where 'Jehovah' is called the 'Elohim of Shem,'—we shall have only *seven* instances in which 'Elohim' is used in ($J^3$) as the Personal Name of God, *viz.* iii.1,3,5,5, (in the conversation between the woman and the *serpent*), ix.27 'Elohim shall enlarge Japheth,' (with whom 'Jehovah' had no special connection), xxxix.9, (where Joseph says to the *Egyptian* woman, 'Shall I sin against Elohim?'), and iv.25, 'Elohim

hath appointed to me another seed,' (in the style of the older notices of the same writer, xli.51,52).

Yet 'Jehovah' is used here *eighty-nine* times as the Personal Name of God, and is freely employed in the story of the Patriarchs, before the Flood and after it.

314. Lastly $J^4$ in 297 verses has 'Elohim' 20 times, and 'Jehovah,' 52 times. But of these 'Elohim,' that in xvi.13, 'Thou El, seest me!' is connected with the derivation of the name 'Ishma*el*'; in xxiv.3,3,7,12,27,42,48, xxvi.24, xxvii.20, xxxii.9,9, 'Elohim' is merely used as an appellative with reference to 'Jehovah,'—'*Jehovah*, the Elohim of heaven, the Elohim of earth, the Elohim of my master Abraham, the Elohim of Abraham (Isaac),' 'thy Elohim'; in xxx.2 we have probably a *proverbial* saying, 'Am I in the place of Elohim?' as in l.19; and in xxxv.1,3,7, we have a peculiar reference to the 'EL of Beth-El.' Removing these, we have only *four* instances, in which 'Elohim' occurs freely in $J^4$, as the Personal Name of God, *viz.* xxvii.28 (ELOHIM) and xxxiii.5,10,11,—in three of which the expression is very similar, 'Elohim give (granted),'* *comp.* xliii.29, while in xxxiii.10 we have, 'I have seen thy face, as though I had seen the face of Elohim.'

Thus in $J^4$, as in $J^3$, 'Jehovah' is used almost exclusively as the Personal Name for God.

* These three phrases seem, in fact, to have been used so commonly, as to have become almost *proverbial*. Thus we have the names *Elnathan*, 2K.xxiv.8, and *Nethaneel*, N.i.8, = 'El gave,' *Jonathan*, Ju.xviii.30, and *Nethaniah*, 2K.xxv.23, = 'Jehovah gave,' *Nathanmelech*, 2K.xxiii.11, = 'the King (? Moleḳh) gave,' as also *Elhanan*, 2S.xxi.19, and *Hananeel*, Neh.iii.1, = 'El granted,' *Johanan*, 2K.xxv.23, and *Hananiah*, 1Ch.xxv.23, = 'Jehovah granted,' *Baalhanan*, 1Ch.xxvii.28, = 'Baal granted,' the inverted form of which, *Hannibal*, does not occur in the Bible; but *comp. Hanniel*, N.xxxiv.23.

It will be seen from the above instances that, in David's time, 1Ch.xxvii.28, *Baal* was used, as well as *El* and *Jah*, in the composition of Proper Names, a phenomenon of great importance, of which other instances are to be found in the Bible, and to which we shall draw more particular attention hereafter.

315. Upon the whole, then, we feel strongly confirmed in the conviction that there is distinct evidence here—as we believe there is in the Psalms (App. II)—of the name 'Jehovah' having become more and more freely used, as the name of the covenant God of Israel, after the time of Samuel. It is possible, of course, that these different sets of passages, $J^1$, $J^2$, $J^3$, $J^4$, may have been written by *more than one* hand in the *slightly-different ages* to which we assign them,—as this would sufficiently account for the similarity of style which exists between them. But there are no distinct indications of this. And the interval of 40 years, assigned as the duration of David's reign, 2S.v.4, 1K.ii.11, would allow of the *same* writer (Nathan, suppose) having written the first of these sets of passages under Saul at the age of 20, and the last under Solomon at the age of 70. It is probable also that the term of 'forty years' is only a general formula to express a long reign, and must not be understood too closely, as determining accurately the duration of David's reign.

# CHAPTER XVII.

## THE COMPLETE ELOHISTIC NARRATIVE IN GENESIS.

We shall now set before the reader a translation of the complete Elohistic narrative in Genesis, as we have been able to extract it from the mould in which it now lies embedded. It will be remembered that, in respect of this document, there is very little difference of opinion between the two eminent German critics, Hupfeld and Boehmer, and myself. It is probable, therefore, that future investigations will not materially modify these conclusions, to which we have been brought independently of each other, and starting from very different points of view. It may be presumed, therefore, that the reader will have here before him a tolerably correct representation of this most interesting narrative—the basis of the Pentateuchal story, and one of the most ancient attempts at historical writing in the world,—and, except in its closing portions, almost in its original form.

In making this translation, as already observed in IV.103–105, we have endeavoured to reproduce the original as exactly and literally as we could,—taking care to render, as far as possible, the same Hebrew word or phrase always by the same English equivalent: so that, as we have said, IV.*p*.64:—

The following version does not pretend to be an elegant, but only a strictly faithful, representation of the original.

## THE ELOHISTIC NARRATIVE.

N.B.—The mark ✠ indicates that an interpolated passage has been removed.

1. [1] In the beginning Elohim created the Heaven and the Earth. [2] And the Earth was desolation and emptiness, and darkness was upon the face of the deep, and the spirit of Elohim hovering upon the face of the waters.

[3] And Elohim said, 'Let there be light,' and there was light. [4] And Elohim saw the light that it was good; and Elohim divided between the light and the darkness. [5] And Elohim called the light 'Day,' and the darkness He called 'Night.' And it was evening, and it was morning,—one day.

[6] And Elohim said, 'Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it be dividing between waters (to) and waters.' [7] And Elohim made the expanse, and divided between the waters which were beneath the expanse and the waters which were above the expanse; and it was so. [8] And Elohim called the expanse 'Heaven.' And it was evening, and it was morning,—a second day.

[9] And Elohim said, 'Let the waters beneath the Heaven be gathered into one place, and let the dry-land appear'; and it was so. [10] And Elohim called the dry-land 'Earth,' and the gathering of waters called He 'Seas'; and Elohim saw that it was good. [11] And Elohim said, 'Let the Earth vegetate vegetation, the herb seeding seed, the fruit-tree making fruit, after its kind, whose seed is in it, upon the Earth'; and it was so. [12] And the Earth brought forth vegetation, the herb seeding seed after its kind, and the tree making fruit, whose seed is in it, after its kind; and Elohim saw that it was good. [13] And it was evening, and it was morning,—a third day.

[14] And Elohim said, 'Let there be luminaries in the expanse of the Heaven, to divide between the day and the night, and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years; [15] and let them be for luminaries in the expanse of the Heaven, to give light upon the Earth': and it was so. [16] And Elohim made the two great luminaries,—the greater luminary for the rule of the day, and the lesser luminary for the rule of the night,—and the stars. [17] And Elohim (gave) placed them in the expanse of the Heaven, to give light upon the Earth, [18] and to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide between the light and the darkness: and Elohim saw that it was good. [19] And it was evening, and it was morning,—a fourth day.

[20] And Elohim said, 'Let the waters swarm with swarming-things of living

soul, and let fowl fly over the Earth upon the face of the expanse of the Heaven.' [21] And Elohim created the great monsters, and every living soul that creepeth, which the waters swarmed after their kind, and every fowl of wing after its kind: and Elohim saw that it was good. [22] And Elohim blessed them, saying, 'Fructify, and multiply, and fill the waters in the Seas, and let the fowl abound in the Earth.' [23] And it was evening, and it was morning,—a fifth day.

[24] And Elohim said, 'Let the Earth bring forth living soul after its kind, cattle, and creeping-thing, and animal of the Earth after its kind'; and it was so. [25] And Elohim made the animal of the Earth after its kind, and the cattle after its kind, and every creeping-thing of the ground after its kind: and Elohim saw that it was good.

[26] And Elohim said, 'Let us make man, in our image, after our likeness; and let them (tread) have-dominion over the fish of the Sea, and over the fowl of the Heaven, and over the cattle, and over every animal of the Earth, and over every creeping-thing that creepeth upon the Earth.' [27] And Elohim created man in His image; in the image of Elohim created He him; male and female created He them. [28] And Elohim blessed them, and Elohim said to them, 'Fructify, and multiply, and fill the Earth, and subdue it; and (tread) have-dominion over the fish of the Sea, and over the fowl of the Heaven, and over every animal that creepeth upon the Earth.' [29] And Elohim said, 'Behold! I give to you every herb seeding seed, which is on the face of all the Earth, and every tree in which is the fruit of a tree seeding seed; to you it shall be for food: [30] and to every animal of the Earth, and to every fowl of the Heaven, and to everything creeping upon the Earth, in which is a living soul, I give every green herb for food'; and it was so. [31] And Elohim saw all that He had made, and behold! it was very good. And it was evening, and it was morning,—the sixth day.

**2.** [1] And the Heaven and the Earth were finished, and all their host. [2] And Elohim finished on the seventh day His work which He had made, and rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. [3] And Elohim blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it; for on it He rested from all His work, which Elohim created (to make) and made.

[4a] These are the generations of the Heaven and the Earth at their creation.*✠

**5.** [1] This is the book of the generations of Adam, in the day of Elohim's creating Adam; in the likeness of Elohim made He him. [2] Male and female created He them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam in the day of their creation.

[3] And Adam lived a hundred and thirty years, and begat, in his likeness, according to his image; and he called his name Seth. [4] And the days of Adam, after his begetting Seth, were eight hundred years, and he begat sons and daughters. [5] And all the days of Adam which he lived were nine hundred and thirty years, and he died.

---

* *v.*4a may have originally *preceded* the narrative to which it refers, i.1, &c., (as in all similar instances with this writer, v.1, vi.9, xi.10,27, xxv.12,19, xxxvi.1,9, xxxvii.2a,) and may have been removed by the Jehovist, and blended with the first words of his own narrative in ii.4b, &c.

[6] And Seth lived an hundred and five years, and begat Enos. [7] And Seth lived, after his begetting Enos, eight hundred and seven years, and he begat sons and daughters. [8] And all the days of Seth were nine hundred and twelve years, and he died.

[9] And Enos lived ninety years, and begat Kenan. [10] And Enos lived, after his begetting Kenan, eight hundred and fifteen years, and he begat sons and daughters. [11] And all the days of Enos were nine hundred and five years, and he died.

[12] And Kenan lived seventy years, and begat Mahalaleel. [13] And Kenan lived, after his begetting Mahalaleel, eight hundred and forty years, and he begat sons and daughters. [14] And all the days of Kenan were nine hundred and ten years, and he died.

[15] And Mahalaleel lived sixty-and-five years, and begat Jared. [16] And Mahalaleel lived, after his begetting Jared, eight hundred and thirty years, and he begat sons and daughters. [17] And all the days of Mahalaleel were eight hundred and ninety-five years, and he died.

[18] And Jared lived an hundred and sixty-two years, and begat Enoch. [19] And Jared lived, after his begetting Enoch, eight hundred years, and he begat sons and daughters. [20] And all the days of Jared were nine hundred and sixty-two years, and he died.

[21] And Enoch lived sixty-and-five years, and begat Methuselah. [22] And Enoch walked with ELOHIM*, after his begetting Methuselah, three hundred years, and he begat sons and daughters. [23] And all the days of Enoch were three hundred and sixty-five years. [24] And Enoch walked with ELOHIM, and he was not, for Elohim took him.

[25] And Methuselah lived an hundred and eighty-seven years, and begat Lamech. [26] And Methuselah lived, after his begetting Lamech, seven hundred and eighty-two years, and he begat sons and daughters. [27] And all the days of Methuselah were nine hundred and sixty-nine years, and he died.

[28] And Lamech lived an hundred and eighty-two years, and begat [Noah]. ✠ [30] And Lamech lived, after his begetting Noah, five hundred and ninety-five years, and he begat sons and daughters. [31] And all the days of Lamech were seven hundred and seventy-seven years, and he died

[32] And Noah was a son of five hundred years, and Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth. ✠

6. [9] These are the generations of Noah.

Noah was a man just and perfect in his generations: Noah walked with ELOHIM. [10] And Noah begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. [11] And the earth was corrupted before the face of ELOHIM, and the earth was filled with violence. [12] And Elohim saw the earth, and behold! it was corrupted; for all flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth.

[13] And Elohim said to Noah, 'The end of all flesh has come before my face; for the earth is full of violence from before them; and behold! I will (corrupt) destroy them with the Earth. [14] Make to thee an Ark of cypress-wood; in cells shalt thou make the Ark, and shalt pitch it within and without with

* We shall print the name thus, in large capitals, whenever it occurs in the original with the *article*.

pitch.✠ [17] And I, behold! I (am bringing) will bring the Flood of waters upon the earth, to (corrupt) destroy all flesh in which is a spirit of life from under the heaven; all which is in the earth shall die. [18] But I establish my covenant with thee; and thou shalt go into the Ark, thou, and thy sons, and thy wife, and thy sons' wives with thee. [19] And out of every living thing out of all flesh, two out of all shalt thou bring into the Ark, to keep-alive with thee; male and female shall they be. [20] Out of the fowl after its kind, and out of the cattle after its kind, out of every creeping-thing of the ground after its kind, two out of all shall come unto thee, to keep-alive. [21] And thou, take to thee out of all food which is eaten, and thou shalt gather it unto thee, and it shall be to thee and to them for food.'

[22] And Noah did according to all which Elohim commanded him,—so did he.✠

7. [6] And Noah was a son of six hundred years, when the Flood of waters was upon the earth. [7] And Noah went, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives with him, into the Ark, from the face of the waters of the Flood. [8] Out of the clean cattle and out of the cattle which are not clean, and out of the fowl and all that creepeth upon the ground, [9] two and two, they came unto Noah into the Ark, male and female, as Elohim commanded Noah.✠

[11] In the six-hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, in the seventeenth day of the month, on this day were broken up all the fountains of the great deep, and the windows of the heaven were opened.✠ [13] On this very same day, (lit. in the bone of this day,) went Noah, and Shem, and Ham, and Japheth, Noah's sons, and Noah's wife, and his sons' three wives with them, into the Ark; [14] they, and every animal after its kind, and all the cattle after its kind, and every creeping-thing that creepeth upon the earth after its kind, and all the fowl after its kind, every bird of every wing. [15] And they came unto Noah into the Ark, two and two, out of all flesh, in which is a spirit of life. [16a] And those coming, male and female out of all flesh they came, as Elohim commanded him. ✠

[18a] And the waters were mighty, and multiplied greatly upon the earth,✠ [19b] and all the high mountains that were under all the heaven, were covered.✠ [21] And all flesh died, that creepeth upon the earth, among fowl, and among cattle, and among animals, and among all the swarming-things that swarm upon the earth, and all man. [22] All in whose nostrils was the breath of a spirit of life, out of all which was in the dry land, died.✠ [23b] And only Noah was left, and what was with him in the Ark.

[24] And the waters were mighty upon the earth a hundred and fifty days.

8. [1] And Elohim remembered Noah, and every animal, and all the cattle, that was with him in the Ark; and Elohim caused-to-pass a wind upon the earth, and the waters subsided. [2a] And the fountains of the deep were stopped and the windows of the heaven;✠ [2b] and the waters decreased at the end of a hundred and fifty days,✠ [4b] in the seventh month, in the seventeenth day of the month.✠ [5] And the waters were decreasing continually until the tenth month: in the tenth month, in the first of the month, the tops of the mountains were seen.✠

[13a] And it came-to-pass in the six hundred-and-first year, in the first month, in the first of the month, the waters were dried up from off the earth:✠ [14] and

in the second month, in the seventeenth day of the month, the earth was dry.

15 And Elohim spake unto Noah, saying, 16 'Go out from the Ark, thou, and thy wife, and thy sons, and thy sons' wives with thee. 17 Every animal that is with thee out of all flesh, among fowl, and among cattle, and among every creeping-thing that creepeth upon the earth, bring forth with thee; and let them swarm in the earth, and fructify, and multiply, upon the earth.'

18 And Noah went out, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives with him. 19 Every animal, every creeping-thing, and every fowl, everything creeping upon the earth,—after their families, they went out from the Ark.✠

9. 1 And Elohim blessed Noah and his sons, and said to them, 'Fructify, and multiply, and fill the earth. 2 And the fear of you and the terror of you shall be upon every animal of the earth, and upon every fowl of the heaven, among all that creepeth the ground, and among the fishes of the sea; into your hand they are given. 3 Every creeping-thing that liveth, to you it shall be for food: as the green herb, I give to you all. 4 Only flesh (in) with its soul, its blood, ye shall not eat. 5 And surely your blood of your souls will I require: from the hand of every animal will I require it, and from the hand of man; from the hand of a man's brother will I require the soul of man. 6 Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of Elohim made He man. 7 And you, fructify and multiply, swarm in the earth, and multiply in it.'

8 And Elohim said unto Noah, and unto his sons with him, saying: 9 'And I, behold! I (am establishing) will establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you, 10 and with every living soul which is with you, among fowl, and among cattle, and among (every animal) all animals of the earth with you, from all going out of the Ark, to every animal of the earth. 11 And I establish my covenant with you, and all flesh shall not be again cut off through the waters of the Flood, and there shall not be again a Flood to (corrupt) destroy the earth.'

12 And Elohim said, 'This is the sign of the covenant which I (am giving) will set between me and you, and every living soul that is with you for perpetual generations. 13 My bow do I (give) set in the cloud, and it shall be for a sign of a covenant between me and the earth. 14 And it shall be, at my bringing-a-cloud upon the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud. 15 And I will remember my covenant which is between me and you and every living soul among all flesh; and there shall not be again the waters for a Flood to (corrupt) destroy all flesh. 16 And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will see it, for a remembrance of the perpetual covenant between Elohim and every living soul among all flesh that is upon the earth.'

17 And Elohim said unto Noah, 'This is the sign of the covenant, which I establish between me and all flesh that is upon the earth.'✠

28 And Noah lived after the Flood three hundred and fifty years. 29 And all the days of Noah were nine hundred and fifty years, and he died.✠

11. 10 These are the generations of Shem.

Shem was a son of a hundred years, and begat Arphaxad two years after the Flood. 11 And Shem lived, after his begetting Arphaxad, five hundred years, and begat sons and daughters.

[12] And Arphaxad lived five-and-thirty years, and begat Salah. [13] And Arphaxad lived, after his begetting Salah, four hundred and three years, and begat sons and daughters.

[14] And Salah lived thirty years, and begat (Heber) Eber. [15] And Salah lived, after his begetting Eber, four hundred and three years, and begat sons and daughters.

[16] And Eber lived four-and-thirty years, and begat Peleg. [17] And Eber lived, after his begetting Peleg, four hundred and thirty years, and begat sons and daughters.

[18] And Peleg lived thirty years, and begat Reu. [19] And Peleg lived, after his begetting Reu, two hundred and nine years, and begat sons and daughters.

[20] And Reu lived two-and-thirty years, and begat Serug. [21] And Reu lived, after his begetting Serug, two hundred and seven years, and begat sons and daughters.

[22] And Serug lived thirty years, and begat Nahor. [23] And Serug lived, after his begetting Nahor, two hundred years, and begat sons and daughters.

[24] And Nahor lived nine-and-twenty years, and begat Terah. [25] And Nahor lived, after his begetting Terah, a hundred and nineteen years, and begat sons and daughters.

[26] And Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran.

[27] And these are the generations of Terah.

Terah begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran; and Haran begat Lot.✠ [31] And Terah took Abram his son, and Lot, the son of Haran, his son's son, and Sarai his daughter-in-law, the wife of Abram his son, and they went out with them together from Ur of the Chaldees to go to the land of Canaan; and they went as far as Charran, and dwelt there. [32] And the days of Terah were two hundred and five years, and Terah died in Charran.✠

**12.** [4b] And Abram was a son of seventy-five years at his going out from Charran. [5] And Abram took Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother's son, and all their gain which they had gotten, and the souls which they had made in Charran, and they went out to go to the land of Canaan, and they came to the land of Canaan.✠ **13.** [6] And the land did not bear them to dwell together, for their gain was much, and they were not able to dwell together.✠ [12] Abram dwelt in the land of Canaan, and Lot dwelt in the cities of the circuit.✠

**16.** [1] And Sarai, Abram's wife, bare not to him, and she had a maid, an Egyptian, and her name was Hagar.✠ [3] And Sarai, Abram's wife, took Hagar the Egyptian, her maid, at the end of ten years of Abram's dwelling in the land of Canaan, and gave her to Abram her husband to him for wife.✠ [15] And Hagar bare to Abram a son, and Abram called the name of his son, which Hagar bare, Ishmael. [16] And Abram was a son of eighty-and-six years at Hagar's bearing Ishmael to Abram.

**17.** [1] And Abram was a son of ninety-and-nine years, and [Elohim*] appeared

---

* This is the only instance where, in the present Hebrew copies of the Bible, 'Jehovah' occurs in the whole Elohistic narrative. The proper formula of the Elohist is seen in xxxv.9, 'And Elohim appeared unto Jacob,' identical with that before us, except in respect of the Divine Name. Since, therefore, 'Elohim' is

unto Abram and said unto him, 'I am El Shaddai: walk before me, and be perfect. [2] And I will (give) set My covenant between me and thee, and I will very greatly multiply thee.'

[3] And Abram fell upon his face, and Elohim spake with him, saying, [4] 'I—behold! My covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of a multitude of nations. [5] And thy name shall not be called any longer Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for I (give) set thee a father of a multitude of nations. [6] And I will very greatly fructify thee, and will (give) set thee for nations; and kings shall go-forth out of thee. [7] And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations, for a perpetual covenant, to be to thee Elohim, and to thy seed after thee. [8] And I will give to thee and to thy seed after thee the land of thy sojournings, the whole land of Canaan, for a perpetual possession, and I will be to them Elohim.'

[9] And Elohim said unto Abram, 'And thou—my covenant thou shalt keep, thou and thy seed after thee in their generations. [10] This is my covenant, which they shall keep between me and you and thy seed after thee,—to be circumcised among you every male. [11] And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, and it shall be for a sign of a covenant between me and you. [12] And a son of eight days shall be circumcised among you, every male in your generations,—child of the house, and purchase of silver from any son of a stranger, which is not out of thy seed. [13] Circumcised shall he surely be, child of thy house and purchase of thy silver; and my covenant shall be in your flesh for a perpetual covenant. [14] And an uncircumcised male, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant.'

[15] And Elohim said unto Abraham, 'Sarai thy wife—thou shalt not call her name Sarai, for Sarah is her name. [16] And I will bless her, and also I will give to thee out of her a son, and I will bless her, and she shall be for nations; kings of peoples shall be out of her.'

[17] And Abraham fell upon his face and laughed, and said in his heart, 'To a son of a hundred years shall there be born, and shall Sarah, a daughter of ninety years, bear?' [18] And Abraham said unto Elohim, 'Would that Ishmael may live before thee!' [19] And Elohim said, 'Truly Sarah thy wife shall bear to thee a son, and thou shalt call his name Isaac; and I will establish my covenant with him for a perpetual covenant to his seed after him. [20] And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee. Behold! I have blessed him, and I have fructified him, and multiplied him, very greatly: twelve princes shall he beget, and I have (given) set him for a great nation. [21] And my covenant will I establish with Isaac, whom Sarah shall bear to thee at this season in the following year.' [22] And Elohim finished to speak with him, and Elohim went-up from Abraham.

[23] And Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all the children of his house,

---

found everywhere else (*ten* times) in this very chapter, it seems very probable that it stood originally in *v.*1, and has been accidentally changed to 'Jehovah,'—perhaps by an oversight of a transcriber. In fact, *the Elohim of v.*3 *evidently presupposes Elohim also in v.*1.

and all the purchase of his silver, every male among the men of Abraham's house; and he circumcised the flesh of their foreskin on the very same day, according as Elohim spake with him. [24] And Abraham was a son of ninety-and-nine years at his being circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin. [25] And Ishmael his son was a son of thirteen years at his being circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin. [26] On that very same day was Abraham circumcised, and Ishmael his son. [27] And all the men of his house, child of the house, and purchase of silver, or from a son of a stranger, were circumcised with him.✠

**19.** [29] And it came to pass, at Elohim's destroying the cities of the circuit, that Elohim remembered Abraham; and He put forth Lot from the midst of the overthrow, at his overthrowing the cities in which Lot dwelt.✠

**21.** [2] And Sarah conceived and bare to Abraham a son to his old-age, according to the season which Elohim had spoken of with him. [3] And Abraham called the name of his son that was born to him, whom Sarah bare to him, Isaac. [4] And Abraham circumcised Isaac his son, a son of eight days, as Elohim had commanded him. [5] And Abraham was a son of a hundred years at Isaac his son's being born to him.✠

23. [1] And the life of Sarah was a hundred and twenty and seven years,—the years of the life of Sarah. [2] And Sarah died in Kirjath-Arba in the land of Canaan; and Abraham came to mourn over Sarah and to weep for her. [3] And Abraham came from before his dead, and spake unto the sons of Heth, saying, [4] 'A sojourner and a dweller am I with you: give to me a possession of a burial-place with you, and I will bury my dead from before me.' [5] And the sons of Heth answered Abraham, saying, [6] '(Would that) Pray hear us, my lord! A prince of Elohim art thou in the midst of us: in the choice of our burial-places bury thy dead; no man of us will hold-back his burying-place from thee, from burying thy dead.'

[7] And Abraham arose, and bowed-himself before the people of the land, to the sons of Heth. [8] And he spake with them, saying, 'If it is your (soul) will for me to bury my dead from before me, hear me, and (reach) entreat for me to Ephron, the son of Zoar; [9] and he shall give to me the cave of Machpelah, which is his, which is in the end of his field: for full silver shall he give it to me in the midst of you for a possession of a burial-place.' [10] And Ephron was dwelling in the midst of the sons of Heth. And Ephron the Hittite answered Abraham in the ears of the sons of Heth, before all entering at the gate of his city, saying, [11] 'No, my lord! hear me: the field I give to thee, and the cave which is in it, to thee I give it: before the eyes of the sons of my people I give it to thee: bury thy dead.'

[12] And Abraham bowed-himself before the people of the land. [13] And he spake to Ephron in the ears of the people of the land, saying, 'Only if thou art for giving it, (would that) pray hear me: I give the silver of the field: take it from me: and I will bury my dead there.' [14] And Ephron answered Abraham, saying, [15] '(Would that) Pray, my lord, hear me: the land is four hundred shekels of silver: between me and thee what is that? so bury thy dead.'

[16] And Abraham hearkened unto Ephron; and Abraham weighed to Ephron the silver which he spake in the ears of the sons of Heth, four hundred shekels of silver, current with the trader. [17] And the field of Ephron, which

was in Machpelah, which was before Mamre, the field, and the cave which was in it, and all the trees which were in the field, which were in all its border round-about, (arose) stood [19] to Abraham for a purchase before the eyes of the sons of Heth, among all entering at the gate of his city.

[19] And afterwards Abraham buried Sarah his wife in the cave of the field of Machpelah, eastward of Mamre✠ in the land of Canaan. [20] And the field, and the cave which was in it (arose) stood to Abraham for a possession of a burying-place from the sons of Heth.✠

25. [7] And these are the days of the years of the life of Abraham, which he lived, a hundred and seventy and five years. [8] And Abraham expired, and died in good gray-hairs, old and full of years, and was gathered unto his people. [9] And Isaac and Ishmael, his sons, buried him in the cave of Machpelah, in the field of Ephron, the son of Zohar the Hittite, which was eastward of Mamre,—[10] the field which Abraham bought from the sons of Heth: there was buried Abraham and Sarah his wife. [11a] And it came-to-pass after Abraham's death that Elohim blessed his son Isaac.✠

[12] And these are the generations of Ishmael, the son of Abraham, whom Hagar the Egyptian, Sarah's maid, bare to Abraham.

[13] And these are the names of the sons of Ishmael, by their names, according to their generations: the firstborn of Ishmael, Nebaioth, and Kedar, and Adbeel, and Mibsam, [14] and Mishma, and Dumah, and Massa, [15] Hadar, and Tema, Jetur, Naphish, and Kedemah. [16] These are the sons of Ishmael, and these are their names, by their villages and by their kraals,—twelve princes after their folks.

[17] And these are the years of the life of Ishmael, a hundred and thirty and seven years; and he expired and died, and was gathered to his people.✠

[19] And these are the generations of Isaac, the son of Abraham.

Abraham begat Isaac. [20] And Isaac was a son of forty years, at his taking Rebekah, the daughter of Bethuel the Syrian, out of Padan-Aram, the sister of Laban the Syrian, to himself for wife. [21b] And Rebekah his wife conceived;✠ [24] and her days were fulfilled to bear, and behold, twins in her womb! [25] And the first came-out red,* all of him, as a mantle of hair,† and they called his name Esau. [26] And afterwards came-out his brother, and his hand grasping upon the heel (*h*akev) of Esau; and (he) one called his name (Ya*h*ăkov) Jacob: and Isaac was a son of sixty years at her bearing them.✠

26. [34] And Esau was a son of forty years, and he took as wife Judith, the daughter of Beeri the Hittite, and Basmath, the daughter of Elon the Hittite. [35] And they were a bitterness of spirit to Isaac and to Rebekah.✠

28. [1] And Isaac called unto Jacob, and blessed him, and charged him, and said to him, 'Thou shalt not take a wife out of the daughters of Canaan. [2] Arise, go to Padan-Aram, to the house of Bethuel thy mother's father; and take to thee from thence a wife out of the daughters of Laban thy mother's brother. [3] And El-Shaddai bless thee, and fructify thee, and multiply thee,

---

* *Admoni*, with play on '*Edom*.'

† *Sehar*, with play on *sehir*, 'Seir,' and, perhaps, also on he*sav*, 'Esau,'—*comp.* *seh*, he*s*.

that thou be for a company of peoples, [4] and give thee the blessing of Abraham, to thee and to thy seed with thee, to thy inheriting the land of thy sojournings, which Elohim gave to Abraham!' [5] And Isaac put-forth Jacob, and he went to Padan-Aram, unto Laban, the son of Bethuel the Aramæan, the brother of Rebekah, the mother of Jacob and Esau.

[6] And Esau saw that Isaac had blessed Jacob, and had sent-him-away to Padan-Aram, to take to him from thence a wife,—in blessing him too he charged him, saying, 'Thou shalt not take a wife out of the daughters of Canaan,'—[7] and Jacob hearkened unto his father and unto his mother, and went to Padan-Aram. [8] And Esau saw that the daughters of Canaan were evil in the eyes of Isaac his father. [9] And Esau went unto Ishmael, and took Mahalath, the daughter of Ishmael, the son of Abraham, the sister of Nebaioth, (upon) over-and-above his wives, to him to wife.✠*

29. [24] And Laban gave to her Zilpah his maid, to Leah his daughter as maid.✠ . . . [29] And Laban gave to Rachel his daughter Bilhah his maid for maid.✠ . . . [32ab] And Leah conceived and bare a son, . . . and she called his name Reuben. ✠ [33ad] And she conceived again and bare a son ✠ . . . and she called his name Simeon. [34b] And she conceived again and bare a son.✠ . . . [35ad] And she conceived again and bare a son✠ . . . and she stood from bearing.

30. [1a] And Rachel saw that she bare not to Jacob,✠ [4a] and she gave to him Bilhah her maid for wife.✠ [5] And Bilhah conceived and bare to Jacob a son. [6a] And Rachel said, 'Elohim hath judged (dan) me.'✠ . . . [7] And Bilhah, Rachel's maid, conceived again, and bare a second son to Jacob. [8ac] And Rachel said, 'With wrestlings (naphtulim) of Elohim have I wrestled with my sister,'✠ and she called his name Naphtali.

[9] And Leah saw that she had stood from bearing; and she took Zilpah her maid, and gave her to Jacob for wife. [10] And Zilpah, Leah's maid, bare to Jacob a son. [11] And Leah said, 'A troop (gad)!' and she called his name Gad.

---

* There occurs here the first hiatus, as we suppose, in the Elohistic document,—the original statement of the marriage of Jacob (which was, probably, as brief as that of Isaac's marriage by the same writer in xxv.19) having been removed, to make way for the more circumstantial narrative of the Jehovist in xxix. Still, it would seem, some fragments of the older story have been retained, as below, and that the births of all Jacob's sons, *including Benjamin*, were here given, and their names derived or played-upon by this writer; just as in xvii.5,15, he has alluded to the meaning of *Abraham* and *Sarah*,—in xvii.17,20 to those of *Isaac* ('Abraham *laughed*'), and *Ishmael* ('I have *heard* thee'),—in xx.25,26 to those of *Edom* and *Jacob*,—in xxxv.10,11,15, to those of *Israël* and *Bethel*. But *here* the E. derivations have been much overlaid by J. insertions. It is plain that in *v.*20 the name *Zebulun* is *twice* derived, *viz.* from *zabad*, 'dower,' and *zabal*, 'dwell'; and so in *Joseph* in *v.*23,24, (from *asaph*, 'gather' = 'take away,' and *yasaph*, 'add';) while in *v.*14–16 a different explanation is implied of the name *Issachar* (from *sachar*, 'hire,') from what was intended by the writer of *v.*9,18. We may suppose that the Jehovist disapproved of some of the Elohistic derivations, thinking them, perhaps, far-fetched or indistinct; and he has consequently sometimes *added* his own, and sometimes *substituted* his own for that of the Elohist.

12 And Zilpah, Leah's maid, bare a second son to Jacob. 13 And Leah said, 'My blessing! for daughters will bless (ashar) me': and she called his name Asher.✠

17 And Elohim hearkened unto Leah, and she conceived, and bare to Jacob a fifth son. 18ac And Leah said, 'Elohim hath given me my hire (sachar);'✠ and she called his name Issachar. 19 And Leah conceived (yet) again, and bare a sixth son to Jacob. 20ac And Leah said, 'Elohim hath presented (zabad) me with a good present,'✠ and she called his name Zebulun. 21 And afterwards she bare a daughter, and she called her name Dinah.

22 And Elohim remembered Rachel, and Elohim hearkened unto her, and opened her womb. 23 And she conceived and bare a son, and she said, 'Elohim hath gathered (asaph) my reproach!' 24a And she called his name Joseph.✠ *

31. 18a* And he led-away all his cattle, and all his gain which he had gotten, the cattle of his property, which he had gotten in Padan-Aram, to go unto Isaac his father, to the land of Canaan.✠

35. 9 And Elohim appeared unto Jacob again † at his coming from Padan-Aram, and spake with him: 10 and Elohim said to him, 'Thy name (is) Jacob: thy name shall not be called any longer Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name': and He called his name Israel. 11 And Elohim said to him, 'I am El-Shaddai: fructify and multiply: a nation and a company of nations shall be out of thee; and kings shall go-forth out of thy loins. 12 And the land, which I gave to Abraham and to Isaac, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed after thee I will give the land.'

13 And Elohim went-up from him in the place where He spake with him. 14 And Jacob erected a pillar in the place where He spake with him,—a pillar of stone; and he dropped upon it a drink-offering, and poured oil upon it. 15 And Jacob called the name of the place, where Elohim spake with him, Beth-El.

16a And they set off from Beth-El, and it was still a space of land to come to Ephrath.✠ 19 And Rachel died, and was buried in the way of Ephrath.✠ 20a And Jacob erected a pillar upon her grave.✠

22b And the sons of Jacob were twelve: 23 the sons of Leah, Jacob's firstborn, Reuben, and Simeon, and Levi, and Judah, and Issachar, and Zebulun; 24 the sons of Rachel, Joseph and Benjamin; 25 and the sons of Bilhah, Rachel's maid, Dan and Naphtali; 26 and the sons of Zilpah, Leah's maid, Gad and Asher. These are the sons of Jacob, which were born to him in Padan-Aram.

27 And Jacob came unto Isaac his father, to Mamre, the city of Arba,✠ where Abraham sojourned, and Isaac. 28 And the days of Isaac were an hundred and eighty years. 29 And Isaac expired, and died, and was gathered unto his people, old and full of days; and Esau and Jacob, his sons, buried him.

36. 1 And these are the generations of Esau—that is, Edom. 2 Esau took his wives out of the daughters of Canaan, Adah, daughter of Elon the Hittite,

---

* Some few words of the Elohistic story seem to be wanting here, similar to those in xii.5 or xxxvi.6,—*e.g.* 'And Jacob took his wives, and his sons, and his daughters, and he led-away all his cattle &c.,'—for which *v.*17 has been substituted by the later writer.

† Does this mean that the appearance to *Jacob* was the *second* time of God's appearing to the Patriarchs, as that to *Abraham*, xvii.1, was the *first*? See *Anal.*(252).

and Aholibamah, daughter of Anah, son of Zibeon the Hivite, [3] and Bashemath, daughter of Ishmael, sister of Nebaioth.

[4] And Adah bare to Esau Eliphaz, and Bashemath bare Reuel, [5] and Aholibamah bare Jeush, and Jaalam, and Korah.

These are the sons of Esau, which were born to him in the land of Canaan.

[6] And Esau took his wives, and his sons, and his daughters, and all the souls of his house, and his cattle and all his beasts, and all his gain which he had gotten in the land of Canaan, and went unto the land of Seir from the face of Jacob his brother. [7] For their gain was plentiful above living together, and the land of their sojourning was not able to bear them because of their cattle. [8] And Esau dwelt in Mount Seir: Esau, he is Edom.

[9] And these are the generations of Esau, the father of Edom, in Mount Seir.

[10] These are the names of the sons of Esau.

Eliphaz, the son of Adah, Esau's wife: Reuel, the son of Bashemath, Esau's wife.

[11] And the sons of Eliphaz,—Teman, Omar, Zepho, and Gatam, and Kenaz.

[12] And Timnah was concubine to Eliphaz, Esau's son; and she bare to Eliphaz Amalek.

These were the sons of Adah, Esau's wife.

[13] And these the sons of Reuel—Nahath and Zerah, Shammah and Mizzah.

These were the sons of Bashemath, Esau's wife.

[14] And these were the sons of Aholibamah, daughter of Anah, (daughter=) granddaughter of Zibeon, Esau's wife.

And she bare to Esau Jeush, and Jaalam, and Korah.

[15] These were dukes (? clans) of the sons of Esau.

The sons of Eliphaz, Esau's firstborn—duke Teman, duke Omar, duke Zepho, duke Kenaz, [16] duke Korah, duke Gatam, duke Amalek.

These were the dukes of Eliphaz in the land of Edom; these were the sons of Adah.

[17] And these the sons of Reuel, Esau's son—duke Nahath, duke Zerah, duke Shammah, duke Mizzah.

These were the dukes of Reuel in the land of Edom; these were the sons of Bashemath, Esau's wife.

[18] And these were the sons of Aholibamah, Esau's wife—duke Jeush, duke Jaalam, duke Korah.

These were the dukes of Aholibamah, daughter of Anah, Esau's wife.

[19] These were the sons of Esau, and these their dukes: he is Edom.

[31] And these were the kings who reigned in the land of Edom, before the reigning of a king over the children of Israel.

[32] And there reigned in Edom Bela the son of Beor, and the name of his city was Dinhabah.

[33] And Bela died, and there reigned in his stead Jobab the son of Zerah, out of Bozrah.

[34] And Jobab died, and there reigned in his stead Husham, out of the land of the Temanite.

[35] And Husham died, and there reigned in his stead Hadad the son of Bedad, and the name of his city was Avith.

[36] And Hadad died, and there reigned in his stead Samlah, out of Masrekah.

37 And Samlah died, and there reigned in his stead Saul (E.V. Shaul), out of
Rehoboth of the River (=Broadways on Euphrates).
38 And Saul died, and there reigned in his stead Baal-Hanan, son of Achbor.
39 And Baal-Hanan, son of Achbor, died, and there reigned in his stead
Hadar, and the name of his city was Pau, and his wife's name was Mehetabel,
daughter of Matred, (daughter) granddaughter of Mezahab.
40 And these are the names of the dukes (? clans) of Esau, according to
their families, according to their places, by their names:—duke Timnah,
duke Alvah, duke Jetheth, 41 duke Aholibamah, duke Elah, duke Pinon,
42 duke Kenaz, duke Teman, duke Mibzar, 43 duke Magdiel, duke Iram.
These are the dukes of Edom, according to their dwellings in the land of
their possession: he is Esau, the father of Edom.

37. 1 And Jacob dwelt in the land of his father's sojournings in the land
of Canaan. 2a These are the generations of Jacob.
Joseph, a son of seventeen years, was tending with his brethren among the
flocks, and he was a lad with the sons of Bilhah and with the sons of Zilpah,
his father's wives,* . . . 28a And there passed-by Midianites, merchantmen*
. . . 36 And the Midianites sold him into Egypt, to Potiphar, an officer of
Pharaoh, Captain of the Guard.*

46. 6 And they took their cattle and their gain which they had gotten in
the land of Canaan, and they came to Egypt, Jacob and all his seed with him.
7 His sons and his sons' sons with him, his daughters and his sons' daughters,
and all his seed, brought he with him to Egypt.
8 And these are the names of the sons of Israel that came to Egypt, Jacob
and his sons: Jacob's firstborn, Reuben: 9 And the sons of Reuben, Enoch

---

* It would seem that no part of the dramatic history of Joseph's being sold into Egypt, and of his adventures there, is from the hand of the Elohist. Indeed, it would be strange if this writer, who has given us so little out of Abraham's life, still less out of Jacob's, and scarcely anything out of Isaac's, should have expatiated at so great length in the history of Joseph. But the Analysis shows that no part of this narrative belongs to him, except, perhaps, *v.*2a,28a,36, which we assign to him, as above, though with some hesitation. As he knows nothing of any ill-blood between Sarah and Hagar, Ishmael and Isaac, Esau and Jacob, Leah and Rachel, so he probably knew of none between Joseph and his brothers, and may have represented Joseph here as merely kidnapped and carried off by the Midianites, while out one day, with only *four* of his brethren, tending his father's sheep. It is observable that these 'sons of Bilhah and sons of Zilpah' appear no more in the story. The Elohist may in a very few words have described the carrying-off of Joseph, *e.g.* 'and there passed-by Midianites, merchantmen, [and they saw Joseph and seized him], and the Midianites sold him into Egypt, &c.' The Elohist may then have stated briefly how he came to be high in office under Pharaoh, and how Jacob and his sons became aware of his still being alive, and were induced to go down and settle in Egypt, all which has been removed, and replaced by the narrative which now stands in xxxvii,xxxix—xlv.

(E.V. Hanoch) and Pallu, Hezron and Carmi. [10] And the sons of Simeon, Jemuel, and Jamin, and Ohad, and Jachin, and Zohar, and Saul (E.V. Shaul) son of the Canaanitess. [11] And the sons of Levi, Gershon, and Kohath, and Merari. [12] And the sons of Judah, Er, and Onan, and Shelah, and Pharez, and Zarah.✠ [13] And the sons of Issachar, Tola, and Phuvah, and Job, and Shimron. [14] And the sons of Zebulun, Sered, and Elon, and Jahleel. [15] These are the sons of Leah, which she bare to Jacob in Padan-Aram, and Dinah his daughter —all the souls of his sons and his daughters, thirty-three.

[16] And the sons of Gad, Ziphion, and Haggi, Shuni, and Ezbon, Eri, and Arodi, and Areli. [17] And the sons of Asher, Jimnah, and Ishuah, and Isui, and Beriah, and Serah their sister; and the sons of Beriah, Heber and Malchiel. [18] These are the sons of Zilpah, whom Laban gave to Leah his daughter, and she bare these to Jacob, sixteen souls.

[19] The sons of Rachel, Jacob's wife, Joseph and Benjamin. [20ac] And there were born to Joseph in the land of Egypt,✠ Manasseh and Ephraim. [21] And the sons of Benjamin, Belah, and Becher, and Ashbel, Gera, and Naaman, Ehi and Rosh, Muppim, and Huppim, and Ard. [22] These are the sons of Rachel, which were born to Jacob—all the souls, fourteen.

[23] And the sons of Dan, Hushim. [24] And the sons of Naphtali, Jabzeel, and Guni, and Jezer, and Shillem. [25] These are the sons of Bilhah, whom Laban gave to Rachel his daughter, and she bare these to Jacob—all the souls, seven.

[26abd] All the souls of Jacob that came to Egypt, coming out of his loins,✠ all the souls were sixty-and-six. [27] And the sons of Joseph, which were born to him in Egypt, were two souls. All the souls of the house of Jacob, that came to Egypt, were seventy.✠

47. [7] And Joseph brought Jacob his father, and stationed him before Pharaoh, and Jacob blessed Pharaoh. [8] And Pharaoh said unto Jacob, 'About what are the days of the years of thy life?' [9] And Jacob said unto Pharaoh, 'The days of the years of my sojournings are a hundred and thirty years; few and evil have been the days of the years of my life, and they have not come-up-with the days of the years of the life of my fathers in the days of their sojournings.' [10] And Jacob blessed Pharaoh, and went forth from before Pharaoh.

[11abd] And Joseph settled his father and his brethren, and gave them a possession in the land of Egypt✠ in the land of Rameses;✠ [27b] and they fructified and multiplied exceedingly. [28] And Jacob lived in the land of Egypt seventeen years, and Jacob's days of the years of his life were a hundred and forty-seven years.✠

48. [3] And Jacob said unto Joseph, 'El Shaddai appeared unto me at Luz in the land of Canaan, and blessed me, [4] and said unto me, 'Behold! I will fructify thee and multiply thee, and (give) make thee for a company of peoples; and I will give this land to thy seed after thee, a perpetual possession.' [5] And now, thy two sons, which were born to thee in the land of Egypt (until) before my coming unto thee to Egypt, they are mine, Ephraim and Manasseh: even as Reuben and Simeon, they shall be mine. [6] And thy progeny, which thou hast begotten after them, shall be thine; by the names of their brothers shall they be called in their inheritance. [7] And I, at my coming from Padan

—Rachel died beside me in the land of Canaan, when there was yet a space of land to come to Ephrath; and I buried her there in the way to Ephrath.'✠

49. [16] And Jacob called unto his sons,✠ [29] and he charged them, and said unto them, 'I shall be gathered to my people: bury me unto my fathers, in the cave which is in the field of Ephron the Hittite, [30] in the cave which is in the field of Machpelah, which is east of Mamre, in the land of Canaan, which Abraham bought with the field from Ephron the Hittite, for a possession of a burying-place. [31] There they buried Abraham and Sarah his wife; there they buried Isaac and Rebekah his wife; and there I buried Leah. [32] The purchase of the field, and of the cave which is in it, was from the sons of Heth.' [33] And Jacob ended to charge his sons, and he gathered his feet into the bed, and he expired and was gathered unto his people.✠

50. [13] And his sons carried him to the land of Canaan, and buried him in the cave of the field of Machpelah, which Abraham bought with the field for a possession of a burying-place from Ephron the Hittite, east of Mamre.

# CHAPTER XVIII.

## THE SUCCESSIVE ADDITIONS TO THE ELOHISTIC NARRATIVE IN GENESIS.

### THE FIRST SET OF JEHOVISTIC ADDITIONS ($E_2$ OR $J^1$), *in the latter part of Saul's reign.*

**20.** [1] *And Abraham journeyed from thence* to the land of the South (Negeb), and dwelt between Kadesh and Shur, and sojourned in Gerar.*

[2] *And Abraham said of Sarah his wife, 'She is my sister'; and Abimelech king of Gerar sent and took Sarah.*

[3] *And Elohim came unto Abimelech in a dream of the night and said to him, 'Behold! thou art dead about the woman whom thou hast taken; (and) for she is (lorded by a lord) owned by a husband.'* [4] *And Abimelech had not come-near unto her; and he said, 'My Lord! wilt thou kill a nation though righteous also?* [5] *Did he not say to me, She is my sister? and she, she also said, He is my brother. In the perfectness of my heart and in the innocency of my hands I did this.'*

[6] *And* ELOHIM *said unto him in a dream, 'I also know that in the perfectness of thy heart thou didst this, and I also withheld thee from sinning against me; therefore I did not allow thee to touch her.* [7] *And now, restore the man's wife, for he is a prophet, and he shall pray for thee, so live: but, if thou restore not, know that thou shalt surely die, thou and all which thou hast.'*

[8] *And Abimelech rose-early in the morning, and called to all his servants, and spoke all these words in their ears; and the men feared greatly.* [9] *And Abimelech called to Abraham and said to him, 'What hast thou done to us? and what have I sinned against thee, that thou hast brought upon me and upon my kingdom a great sin? Deeds, which are not done, hast thou done with me.'* [10] *And Abimelech said unto Abraham, 'What hast thou seen that thou hast*

* The beginning of these insertions is abrupt—'Abraham journeyed *from thence*,'—there being no place mentioned in the immediate context to which these words can be referred. But this difficulty remains on *any* supposition,—upon the *traditionary* view, as well as upon that of HUPFELD and BOEHMER,—and seems to be best explained by our own words: *viz.* that $E_2$ has used them rather loosely, without reference to any particular place, but merely as a means of introducing his episode. They might, however, be referred to xiii.12[a], 'Abram dwelt in the *land of Canaan*.'

*done this thing?'* 11 *And Abraham said, 'For I said, (Only) Surely, there is no fear of God in this place, and they will slay me because of my wife.* 12 *And also, in truth, she is my sister, the daughter of my father, only not the daughter of my mother, and she became wife to me.* 13 *And it-came-to-pass, (as) when Elohim caused-me-to-wander from my father's house, then I said to her, This is the mercy which thou shalt do with me at every place whither we shall go: say of me, He is my brother.'*

14 *And Abimelech took flocks and herds, and gave to Abraham and restored to him Sarah his wife.* 15 *And Abimelech said, 'Behold! my land is before thee: dwell in what is good in thine eyes.'* 16 *And to Sarah he said, 'Behold! I give a thousand of silver to thy brother. Behold! it is to thee a covering of the eyes for all (offence) which is with thee and with everyone; so thou art made-right.'*

17 *And Abraham prayed unto* ELOHIM, *and Elohim healed Abimelech and his wife and his maidens, and they bare.*

E(**21.2–5**). 8 *And the child grew and was weaned, and Abraham made a great feast on the day of Isaac's weaning.* 9 *And Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, which she bare to Abraham, (laughing) mocking.* 10 *And she said to Abraham, 'Drive-out this maiden and her son; for this maiden's son shall not inherit with my son, with Isaac.'* 11 *And the thing was very evil in the eyes of Abraham on account of his son.* 12 *And Elohim said unto Abraham, 'Let it not be evil in thine eyes for the boy and for thy maiden; as to all which Sarah says unto thee, hearken unto her voice; for by Isaac shall a seed be called to thee.* 13 *And also the maiden's son I will place him for a nation; for thy seed is he.'*

14 *And Abraham rose-early in the morning, and took bread and a skin of water, and gave (them) unto Hagar, placing (them) upon her shoulder, and the child, and he put her forth: and she went and wandered in the wilderness of Beersheba.* 15 *And the water was finished out of the skin, and she cast the child under one of the bushes.* 16 *And she went and sat-her-down over-against, making-a-distance as drawers of the bow; for she said, 'Let me not see at the death of the child': and she sat-down over-against, and lifted-up her voice and wept.*

17 *And Elohim heard the voice of the boy; and the angel of Elohim called unto Hagar out of heaven and said to her, 'What hast thou, Hagar? Fear not: for Elohim hath hearkened unto the voice of the boy where he is.* 18 *Arise, lift-up the boy, and fasten thy hand upon him; for I will place him for a great nation.'* 19 *And Elohim opened her eyes, and she saw a well of water, and she filled the skin with water, and made the boy drink.* 20 *And Elohim was with the boy, and he grew, and dwelt in the wilderness, and was great in the bow.*

22 *And it came to pass at that time that Abimelech said, and Phichol the captain of his host, unto Abraham, saying, 'Elohim is with thee in all that thou*

*art doing.* [23] *And now swear to me by Elohim here, that thou wilt not be-false to me and to my son and to my grandson; according to the mercy which I have done with thee, shalt thou do with me, and with the land where thou hast sojourned.'* [24] *And Abraham said, 'I will swear.'* [25] *And Abraham set-right Abimelech on account of the well of water which Abimelech's servants had taken-by-force.* [26] *And Abimelech said, 'I know not who has done this thing; and thou also didst not tell me; and I also have not heard it, except to-day.'* [27a] *And Abraham took flocks and herds, and gave to Abimelech;* [32] *and they (cut) made a covenant at Beersheba. And Abimelech arose, and Phichol the captain of his host, and they returned unto the land of the Philistines.*

E(**23.**1-20,**25.**7-11a,12-17,19,20,21b,24-26.)

**26.** [18] *And Isaac dug again the wells of water,* which they dug in the days of Abraham his father; (and) for the Philistines had stopped them after Abraham's death. And he called to them names, as the names which his father had called to them.*

E(**28.**1-9,**29.**24,29, &c., **30.**1a,4a, &c., **31.**18,**35.**9-15, &c., **36.**1-19, &c., **37.**1,2a,28a,36).

**40.** [2] *And Pharaoh was wroth (upon) at two of his officers, upon the chief of the butlers and upon the chief of the bakers.*† [3] *And he put them in ward, in the house of the chief of the executioners;* [4] *and the chief of the executioners appointed Joseph with them, and he ministered to them; and they were (many) days in ward.*

[5] *And they dreamt a dream, both of them, each his dream, in one night, each according to the interpretation of his dream.* [6] *And Joseph came unto them in the morning and saw them, and behold! they were gloomy.* [7] *And he asked Pharaoh's officers, who were with him in the ward of his master's house, saying, 'Why are your faces (evil) sad to-day?'* [8] *And they said unto him, 'We have dreamt a dream, and there is no interpreter of it.' And Joseph said unto them, 'Are not interpretations Elohim's? Recount them, I pray, to me.'*

[9] *And the chief of the butlers recounted his dream to Joseph, and said to him, 'In my dream, (and) behold! a vine before me!* [10] *And in the vine were three branches; and it was as if sprouting; its blossoms came-up, its clusters ripened grapes.* [11] *And Pharaoh's cup was in my hand, and I took the grapes, and pressed them into Pharaoh's cup, and gave the cup upon Pharaoh's hand.'*

* $E_2$ seems here to have chiefly in view the well at Beersheba, on which he has laid stress in Abraham's life above, xxi.24-26, if he does not also allude to it in xxi.19.

† $E_2$ says always '*chief* of the butlers,' '*chief* of the bakers,' not 'butler' and 'baker,' as in xl. Joseph also in $E_2$ is merely a servant or slave of the 'chief of the executioners,' xli.12, and, as such, he is appointed to serve the high officers in the 'ward of his master's house,' xl.4. But he was not a *prisoner*, as in xxxix.20, &c.; and $E_2$ says nothing about the 'house of the tower,' xxxix.20, &c.

12 *And Joseph said to him, 'This is its interpretation. The three branches, they are three days.* 13 *In three days more Pharaoh will lift-up thy head, and restore thee (upon) to thy (nest) place; and thou shalt give Pharaoh's cup into his hand, according to the former custom when thou wast his butler.* 14 *But remember me with thee, (as) when it shall be well to thee, and do with me mercy, I pray, and make-remembrance of me unto Pharaoh, and bring me out of this house.* 15 *For I was indeed stolen* out of the land of the Hebrews: and also here I have not done anything for which they have put me in this (pit) dungeon.'*†

16 *And the chief of the bakers saw that he interpreted good, and he said unto Joseph, 'I, too, in my dream, (and) behold! three baskets of white-bread upon my head!* 17 *And in the topmost basket was some of all Pharaoh's meat, the bakers' work; and the birds were eating them out of the basket from off my head.'*

18 *And Joseph answered and said, 'This is the interpretation. The three baskets, they are three days.* 19 *In three days more Pharaoh shall lift-up thy head from off thee, and hang thee upon a tree, and the birds shall eat thy flesh from off thee.'*

20 *And it came-to-pass on the third day, the day of Pharaoh's birth, that he made a feast to all his servants. And he lifted-up the head of the chief of the butlers and the head of the chief of the bakers in the midst of his servants.* 21 *And he restored the chief of the butlers (upon) unto his butlership; and he gave the cup upon Pharaoh's hand.* 22 *And the chief of the bakers he hanged, as Joseph had interpreted to them.*

23 *And the chief of the butlers remembered not Joseph, but forgat him.*

**41.** 1 *And it came-to-pass at the end of two years of days, that Pharaoh was dreaming, and behold! he was standing by the river.* 2 *And behold! out of the river were coming seven kine, fair of appearance and fat of flesh; and they fed in the marsh.* 3 *And behold! seven other kine coming after them out of the river, evil of appearance and thin of flesh; and they stood by the kine on the brink of the river.* 4 *And the kine, evil of appearance and thin of flesh, ate-up the seven kine, fair of appearance and fat. And Pharaoh awoke.*

5 *And he slept and dreamed a second (time), and behold! seven ears coming up on one stalk, fat and good.* 6 *And behold seven ears, thin and blasted with the east-wind, sprouting after them.* 7 *And the thin ears devoured the seven ears, the fat and the full. And Pharaoh awoke, and behold! it was a dream.*

8 *And it came-to-pass in the morning that his spirit was disturbed. And he sent and called the diviners of Egypt and all her wise-men; and Pharaoh*

* 'Stolen' = kidnapped by the Midianites, as told (we suppose) by E in xxxvii. 2a,28a.

† He means to say, 'though here I am shut-up with you in this dungeon, I am not a prisoner, I have done nothing for which I should be kept here in prison.'

*recounted to them his dream; and there was none interpreting them to Pharaoh.*
9 *And the chief of the butlers spake unto Pharaoh, saying, 'My sins do I remember this day.* 10 *Pharaoh was wroth (upon) at his servants, and put me in ward in the house of the chief of the executioners, me and the chief of the bakers.* 11 *And we dreamed a dream in one night, I and he, each according to the interpretation of his dream we dreamed.* 12 *And there with us was a Hebrew boy, slave to the chief of the executioners; and we recounted to him, and he interpreted to us, our dream,—to each according to his dream he interpreted.* 13 *And it came-to-pass as he interpreted to us, so it was; me he restored (upon) unto my (nest) place, and him he hanged.'*

14 *And Pharaoh sent and called Joseph, and they made him run out of the (pit) dungeon, and he shaved and changed his garments, and went-in unto Pharaoh.* 15 *And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, 'I have dreamed a dream, and there is none interpreting it: and I have heard about thee, saying, thou hearest a dream to interpret it.'* 16 *And Joseph answered Pharaoh, saying, 'Not I! Elohim will answer the peace of Pharaoh.'*

17 *And Pharaoh spake unto Joseph, 'In my dream, (and) behold me standing by the brink of the river!* 18 *And behold! out of the river coming seven kine, fat of flesh and fair of form; and they fed in the marsh.* 19 *And behold! seven other kine coming-up after them, feeble and very evil of form and meagre of flesh: I have not seen such as these in all the land of Egypt for evil.* 20 *And the kine, the meagre and the evil, ate-up the first kine, the fat (ones).* 21 *And they went into their inside, and it was not known that they had gone into their inside, (and) for their appearance was evil as at the beginning. And I awoke.* 22 *And I saw in my dream, and behold! seven ears coming-up upon one stalk, full and good.* 23 *And behold! seven ears, withered, thin, parched with the east-wind, sprouting after them.* 24 *And the thin ears devoured the seven good ears. And I (said) spake unto the diviners, and there is none telling me.'*

25 *And Joseph said unto Pharaoh, 'Pharaoh's dream is one: what* ELOHIM *is doing, he has told to Pharaoh.* 26 *The seven good kine, they are seven years, and the seven good ears they are seven years: the dream is one.* 27 *And the seven kine, the meagre and the evil, coming-up after them, they are seven years; and the seven empty ears, parched with the east-wind, will be seven years of famine.* 28 *This is the thing which I speak unto Pharaoh: what* ELOHIM *is doing, he maketh Pharaoh to see.* 29 *Behold! seven years are coming of great plenty in all the land of Egypt.* 30 *And there shall arise seven years of famine, after them, and all the plenty shall be forgotten in the land of Egypt, and the famine shall finish the land.** 32 *And about the dream being repeated twice unto Pharaoh, it is that the thing is determined from* ELOHIM, *and* ELOHIM *is hastening to do it.* 33 *And now let Pharaoh (see) look-out a man prudent*

* *v.*31($J^2$) merely expands and explains more fully the statement in *v.*30; and the phrase, 'for it shall be very heavy,' is that of J in xii.10, xliii.1, xlvii.4,13.

*and wise, and place him over the land of Egypt.* [34] *Let Pharaoh do (it), and let him appoint officers over the land, and tax-to-the-fifth the land of Egypt in the seven years of plenty.** [36] *And the food shall be for a store for the land for the seven years of famine, which shall be in the land of Egypt, and the land shall not be cut-off through the famine.'*

[37] *And the thing was good in the eyes of Pharaoh, and in the eyes of all his servants.* [38] *And Pharaoh said unto his servants, 'Shall we find, like this, a man in whom is the spirit of Elohim?'* [39] *And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, 'After Elohim's making thee to know all this, there is none prudent and wise as thou.'*† [44] *And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, 'I am Pharaoh, and without thee shall no man lift his hand or his foot in all the land of Egypt.'* [45] *And Pharaoh called Joseph's name Zaphnath-Paaneah (revealer of secrets); and he gave to him Asenath, daughter of Potipherah, priest of On, for wife. And Joseph went-out over the land of Egypt.*

[47] *And the land made in the seven years of plenty by handfuls.*‡ [56] *And the famine was upon all the face of the land: and Joseph opened all wherein was (store of food), and sold to the Egyptians: and the famine was strong in the land of Egypt.* [57] *And all the earth, they came to Egypt unto Joseph to buy: for the famine was strong in all the earth.*

**42.** [5] *And the children of Israel came to buy among those coming: for the famine was in the land of Canaan.* [6a] *And Joseph he was the vizier over the land: he was the seller to all the people of the land.* [7a] *And Joseph saw his brethren, and he recognised them.*

**45.** [16] *And the (voice) rumour was heard in the house of Pharaoh, saying, Joseph's brethren have come: and it was good in the eyes of Pharaoh and in the eyes of his servants.* [17] *And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, 'Say unto thy brethren, This do ye: lade your beasts, and go, get you to the land of Canaan.* [18] *And take your father,§ and your houses, and come unto me: and I will give to you the good of the land of Egypt, and ye shall eat the fat of the land.'*

E(**46.**7–11$^{abd}$,27$^{b}$,28, **48.**3–7, **49.**1$^{a}$,28$^{b}$–33, **50.**13.)

* *v.*35(J$^{2}$) contains 'corn' as in xli.35,49, xlii.3,25, xlv.23,—'under the hand of,' as in xxxix.23,—'collect,' as in xlix.2,—which are not used by $E_2$; and it speaks of collecting *all* the corn, instead of taking only *one-fifth* of it, as in *v.*34($E_2$).

† The reasons for not giving *v.*40–43 to $E_2$ are explained in the Analysis, and so in other cases, where no note of explanation is here appended.

‡ Perhaps, a few words of $E_2$, the apodosis to *v.*33,34($E_2$), may have been here struck out, and replaced by *v.*48(J), corresponding to *v.*35(J).

§ It must be supposed, of course, that, before Pharaoh said this, he had spoken with Joseph, and heard from him about his father &c. This, indeed, must be understood in any case, even on the traditionary view, which supposes that the whole context is by one writer; since neither Pharaoh himself, nor any of Pharaoh's house, had been present when Joseph made himself known to his brethren, xlv.1–15.

## THE SECOND SET OF JEHOVISTIC INSERTIONS ($J^2$),

*in the second decade of David's reign.*

E(**1.**1–31, &c. **19.**29), $J^1$(**20.**1–17).

E(**21.**2–5). [6]And Sarah said, 'Laughter has Elohim made for me! every one that heareth shall laugh for me.' [7]And she said, 'Who would have announced to Abraham, Sarah has suckled children! for I have borne a son to his old-age.'

$J^1$(**21.**8–20). [21]And he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran; and his mother took for him a wife out of the land of Egypt.

$J^1$(**21.**22–27ª). [27b]And they cut a covenant both of them. [28]And Abraham stood seven ewes of the flock apart-by-themselves. [29]And Abimelech said unto Abraham, 'What are these seven ewes, which thou hast stood apart-by-themselves?' [30]And he said, 'For seven ewes shalt thou take out of my hand (for the sake of) in order that it may become a witness for me that I have dug this well.' [31]Therefore (he) one called to that place Beer-sheba (=well of seven): for there they sware both of them. $J^1$(*v.*32).

[33]And he planted a tamarisk in Beer-sheba, and he called there upon the name of Jehovah, El Everlasting. [34]And Abraham sojourned in the land of the Philistines many days.

**22.** [1]And it came to pass after these things that Elohim proved Abraham, and said unto him, 'Abraham!' and he said, 'Behold me!' [2]And He said, 'Take, I pray thee, thy son, thy only son, whom thou lovest, Isaac, and get thee unto the land of (Moriah) Moreh, and offer him there for a burnt-offering upon one of the mountains which I will (say unto thee) tell thee of.'

[3]And Abraham rose-early in the morning, and (bound) saddled his ass, and took two of his lads with him, and Isaac his son, and clave the wood of the burnt-offering; and he arose and went unto the place which Elohim had (said to him) told him of. [4]In the third day then Abraham lifted up his eyes, and saw the place from afar. [5]And Abraham said unto his lads, 'Stay (dwell) you here with the ass, and I and the lad will go as far as there, and we will worship, and return unto you.' [6]And Abraham took the wood of the burnt-offering, and placed *it* upon Isaac his son; and he took in his hand the fire and the knife; and they went both of them together.

[7]And Isaac said unto Abraham his father, and he said, 'My father!' and he said, 'Behold me, my son!' and he said, 'Behold the fire and the wood! and where is the lamb for a burnt-offering?' [8]And Abraham said, 'Elohim will see for himself the lamb for a burnt-offering, my son.' And they went both of them together.

[9]And they came unto the place which Elohim had (said to him) told him of; and Abraham built there the altar, and laid-out the wood, and bound Isaac his son, and placed him upon the altar above the wood. [10]And Abraham put forth his

hand, and took the knife to slay his son. [11]And the angel of Jehovah called unto him out of the heaven and said, 'Abraham! Abraham!' and he said 'Behold me!' [12]And he said, 'Put not forth thy hand unto the lad, and do not to him anything: for now I know that thou fearest Elohim, and hast not withheld thy son, thy only son, from me.' [13]And Abraham lifted up his eyes and saw, and behold a ram behind *him*, caught in the thicket by his horns! and Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him for a burnt-offering instead of his son.

[19]And Abraham returned unto his lads, and they arose and went together into Beersheba, and Abraham dwelt in Beersheba.

E(**23.**1–20,**25.**7–11ª,12–17,19,20,21ᵇ,24–26,**26.**34,35,**28.**1–9).

**28.** [10]And Jacob went forth from Beersheba, and went to Charran. [11]And he reached the place, and spent-the-night there; and he took out of the stones of the place, and placed *it* as his pillow, and he slept in that place. [12]And he dreamed, and behold a ladder standing earthward and its head touching heavenward! and behold angels of Elohim going-up and going-down by it! [13]and behold Jehovah standing by him! and He said, 'I am Jehovah, the Elohim of Abraham thy father, and the Elohim of Isaac; the land which thou liest upon, to thee will I give it and to thy seed. [14]And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt break-forth seaward, and eastward, and northward, and southward; and by thee shall all families of the ground be blessed, (and by thy seed).* [15]And behold! I am with thee, and will keep thee in all *the way* which thou goest, and will return thee to this ground; for I will not leave thee until that I have done what I have spoken to thee.'

[16]And Jacob awaked from his sleep and said, 'Truly there is Jehovah in this place, and I knew *it* not.' [17]And he feared and said, 'How fearful is this place! This is no other than the House of Elohim and this the Gate of Heaven!' [18]And Jacob rose-early in the morning, and took the stone which he placed as his pillow, and placed it as a pillar, and poured oil upon its head. [19]And he called the name of that place Beth-El: however, Luz was the name of the city at the first.

[20]And Jacob vowed a vow, saying, 'If Elohim will be with me, and will keep me in this way in which I am going, and will give to me bread for food and raiment for wearing, [21]and I return in peace unto the house of my father, then Jehovah shall become for me Elohim; [22]and this stone, which I have placed as a pillar, shall be a House of Elohim; and all which Thou shalt give to me I will surely tithe to Thee.'

**29.** [1]And Jacob lifted up his feet, and went unto the land of the sons of the east. [2]And he saw, and behold a well in the field! and behold three flocks of sheep there couching by it,—for out of that well the flocks drank,—and the great stone upon the mouth of the well! [3]And all the flocks were gathered thither, and they rolled the stone from off the mouth of the well, and watered the flock, and put-back the stone upon the mouth of the well to its place.

---

* These words 'and by thy seed,' are, perhaps, a Deuteronomistic interpolation: *see Analysis*, (186.xiv.N.B.).

'And Jacob said unto them, 'My brethren, whence are ye?' And they said, 'From Charran are we.' [5]And he said to them, 'Know ye Laban the son of Nahor?' And they said, 'We know *him*.' [6]And he said to them, '*Is it* peace to him?' And they said, '*It is* peace; and behold Rachel his daughter coming with the flock!' [7]And he said, 'Behold! (the day is still great) it is still high day; *it is* not time *for* the cattle to be gathered: water the flock, and go, feed.' [8]And they said, 'We cannot, until all the flocks are gathered, and they roll the stone from-off the mouth of the well; then we water the flock.'

[9]He still speaking with them, then Rachel came with the flock which *belonged* to her father, for she was feeding *them*. [10]And-it-came-to-pass when Jacob saw Rachel, the daughter of Laban, his mother's brother, and the flock of Laban, his mother's brother, then Jacob came-near, and rolled the stone from-off the mouth of the well, and watered the flock of Laban his mother's brother. [11]And Jacob kissed Rachel, and lifted-up his voice, and wept. [12]And Jacob told Rachel that he *was* her father's brother and that he *was* Rebekah's son; and she ran, and told her father. [13]And-it-came-to-pass, at Laban's hearing the report of Jacob his sister's son, that he ran to meet him, and embraced him, and kissed-him heartily, and brought him in into his house; and he recounted to Laban all these things. [14]And Laban said unto him, 'Just my bone and my flesh *art* thou!' and he dwelt with him a (month of days) full month.

[15]And Laban said to Jacob, 'Is it because thou *art* my brother, that I shall make-thee-to-serve gratis? Tell me, what *shall be* thy pay.' [16]And to Laban there were two daughters, the name of the (great) elder Leah, and the name of the (little) younger, Rachel. [17]And Leah's eyes were tender; and Rachel was fair of face, and fair of form. [18]And Jacob loved Rachel, and he said, 'I will serve thee seven years for Rachel thy (little) younger daughter.' [19]And Laban said, *It is* good *that* I give her to thee rather-than *that* I give her to another man: dwell with me.' [20]And Jacob served for Rachel seven years, and they were in his eyes as some days, for his loving her.

[21]And Jacob said unto Laban, 'Give-here my wife, for my days have-been-fulfilled, and I will go-in unto her.' [22]And Laban gathered all the men of the place, and made a feast. [23]And-it-came-to-pass in the evening, that he took Leah his daughter, and brought her unto him, and he went in unto her. E(*v.*24). [25]And it-came-to-pass in the morning, and behold! it *was* Leah: and he said unto Laban, 'What is this thou hast done to me? Have I not served with thee for Rachel? and wherefore hast thou tripped-me-up?' [26]And Laban said, 'It is not done thus in our place to give the younger before the firstborn. [27]Fulfil the week of this-one (Leah),* and we will give to thee also this-one (Rachel), for the service which thou shalt serve with me yet seven other years.' [28]And Jacob did so, and fulfilled

---

* 'Fulfil the week of this-one,' *i.e.* apparently, fulfil the *marriage-festival* of Leah, which lasted a week: *comp* Ju.xiv.12, where Samson's wedding-feast lasted 'seven days,' and Tob.xi.19, 'And Tobias' wedding was kept *seven days* with great joy.'

the week of this-one; and he gave him Rachel his daughter to him for wife. E(*v.*29). [30]And he went-in also unto Rachel, and he loved also Rachel more than Leah; and he served with him yet seven other years.

E(**29.**32[ab],33[ad],34[a],35[ad],**30.**1[a],4[a],5,6[a],7,8[ac],9–13,17,18[ac],19,20[ac],21–24[a]).

**30.** [25]And it came-to-pass, when Rachel had borne Joseph, then Jacob said unto Laban, 'Send-me-away, and let me go unto my place and to my land. [26]Give my wives and my children, for whom I have served thee, and let me go: for thou-thou knowest my service with which I have served thee.' [27a]And Laban said unto him, 'If now I have found favour in thine eyes*. . . .' [31]And he said, 'What shall I give thee?' And Jacob said, 'Thou shalt not give me anything: if thou wilt do this thing for me, I will (return and) again tend thy flock and keep *it*. [32]I will pass-over among all thy flock this day, removing from thence every sheep speckled and spotted, and every brown sheep among the lambs, and spotted and speckled among the goats, and (it=) such as these shall be my hire. [33]And my righteousness shall answer for me (in the day of the morrow) hereafter, for it shall come upon my hire before thee; all which is not speckled and spotted among the goats and brown among the lambs, that shall be stolen with me.' [34]And Laban said. 'Behold! (would that it may be=) I would wish it to be according to thy words.' [35]And he (Laban) separated on that day the he-goats, the ringstraked and the spotted, and all the she-goats, the speckled, and the spotted, all wherein *was any* white, and all brown among the lambs, and gave *them* into the hand of his sons. [36]And he placed a (way) journey of three days between him and Jacob; and Jacob fed the flock of Laban, those remaining.

[37]And Jacob took to him rods of green poplar, and hazel, and chestnut; and he peeled in them white strakes, laying-bare the white which *was* in the rods. [38]And he set the rods, which he had peeled, in the gutters in the troughs of water, to which the flock came to drink, over-against the flock; and they conceived at their going to drink. [39]And the flock conceived before the rods, and the flock bare ringstraked, speckled, and spotted. [40]And Jacob separated the lambs, and (gave) set the face of the flock towards any ringstraked and all brown among the flock of Laban; and he placed flocks for himself apart-by-himself, and put them not with Laban's flock. [41]And it came-to-pass, at every conceiving of the flock, the strong-ones, then Jacob placed the rods before the eyes of the flock in the gutters, (for their conceiving) that they might conceive among the rods. [42]And at (making-feeble the flock) seeing the flock to be feeble, he placed them not; and the feeble were for Laban, and the strong for Jacob.

**31.** [2]And Jacob saw Laban's face, and behold! it was not with him as (yesterday and the day-before) formerly. [4]And Jacob sent and called to Rache and Leah, *to come* to the field unto the flock. [5]And he said to them, 'I see your father's face, that it is not towards me as (yesterday and the day-before) formerly: (and) but the Elohim of my father has been with me. [6]And ye-ye know that with all

* The sentence is left thus unfinished in the original, and probably in this form *implies* an entreaty that Jacob would remain.

my strength I have served your father. [7]And your father has deceived me, and hath changed my wages ten times; (and) but Elohim suffered him not to do evil with me. [8]If thus he said, 'Speckled shall be thy pay,' then all the flock bare speckled; and if thus he said, 'Ringstraked shall be thy pay,' then all the sheep bare ringstraked. [9]And Elohim hath taken-away your father's cattle, and given *them* to me. [10]And it came-to-pass, at the time of the flock's conceiving, then I lifted up mine eyes and saw in a dream, and behold the rams, those (going-up) mounting upon the flock, ringstraked, speckled, and grisled! [11]And the angel of ELOHIM said unto me in a dream, 'Jacob!' and I said, 'Behold me!' [12]And he said, 'Lift-up, I pray, thine eyes, and see all the rams, those mounting upon the flock, ringstraked, speckled, and grisled! for I have seen all which Laban is doing to thee. [13]I am the EL of Beth-El, where thou anointedst a pillar, where thou vowedst to me a vow. Now, arise, go-forth out of this land, and return unto the land of thy kindred.'

[14]And Rachel answered and Leah, and they said to him, '*Is* there still to us portion and inheritance in our father's house? [15]Have we not been regarded (to) for him as strangers? For he sold us, and ate-up entirely our silver. [16]For all the wealth, which Elohim has taken-away from our father, ours it *is* and our children's. And now, all which Elohim hath said unto thee, do.'

[17]And Jacob arose, and lifted-up his sons and his wives upon the camels; E (*v.*18).

[19]And Laban had gone to shear his sheep, and Rachel stole the teraphim which *belonged* to her father. [20]And Jacob (stole the heart of=) stole away from Laban the Aramæan, in that he told him not that he *was* fleeing. [21]And he fled, he and all that he had; and he arose and passed-over the River, and (placed) set his face to Mount Gilead. [22]And it was told to Laban on the third day that Jacob had fled. [23]And he took with him his brethren, and pursued after him a (way) journey of seven days, and he overtook him in Mount Gilead. [24]And Elohim came unto Laban the Aramæan in a dream of the night, and said to him, 'Beware-thee, that thou speak not with Jacob (from good unto evil) either good or evil.' [25]And Laban came-up-with Jacob; and Jacob had pitched his tent in the Mount; and Laban with his brethren pitched in Mount Gilead.

[26]And Laban said to Jacob, 'What hast thou done, and hast (stolen my heart=) stolen away from me, and hast led-away my daughters as made-captive by the sword? [27]Wherefore didst thou (conceal-thyself to flee) flee secretly and (steal me=) steal away from me, and didst not tell me,—and I had sent-thee-away with mirth and with songs, with tabret and with harp,—[28]and didst not allow me to kiss-heartily my sons and my daughters? Now hast thou (made-foolish *thy* doing) done foolishly. [29]It is in the power of my hand to do evil with thee: (and) but the Elohim of your father said yesterday unto me, 'Beware-thee from speaking with Jacob from good to evil.' [30]And now thou wentest eagerly, because thou longedst greatly for thy father's house: wherefore didst thou steal my gods?'

[31]And Jacob answered and said to Laban, 'Because I feared: for I said, Lest thou tear-away thy daughters from me. [32]With whomsoever thou findest thy gods, he shall not live: over-against our brethren discern-thee what is with me, and take it to thee.' And Jacob knew not that Rachel had stolen them.

[33]And Laban went-in into Jacob's tent and into Leah's tent and into the tent of the two maidens, and he found them not, and he went forth out of Leah's tent, and went-in into Rachel's tent. [34]And Rachel had taken the teraphim, and placed them in the camel's furniture, and she sat upon them. And Laban felt all the tent, and he found them not. [35]And she said unto her father, 'Let it not be kindled in thine eyes, my lord, that I cannot arise from before thee; for the way of women is on me;' and he sought and found not the teraphim.

[36]And it was kindled to Jacob, and he chode with Laban. And Jacob answered and said to Laban, 'What is my transgression, what is my sin, that thou hast been hot after me? [37]Whereas thou hast felt all my vessels, what hast thou found out of all the vessels of thy house? Place it here over-against my brethren and thy brethren, and let them set-right between both of us. [38]These twenty years I *have been* with thee: thy ewes and thy she-goats have not aborted, and the rams of thy flock have I not eaten. [39]The torn I brought not unto thee; I bare-the-loss-of it; from my hand didst thou require it, stolen by day and stolen by night. [40]I was so, that in the day drought ate me up, and frost in the night; and my sleep departed from mine eyes. [41]These twenty years I have been in thy house; I served thee fourteen years for thy two daughters, and six years for thy flock; and thou hast changed my hire ten times. [42]Unless the Elohim of my father, the Elohim of Abraham and the Dread of Isaac, had been with me, surely thou hadst now sent-me-away empty. My affliction and the weariness of my hands Elohim, hath seen, and hath set-*thee*-right yesterday.'

[43]And Laban answered and said unto Jacob, 'The daughters are my daughters, and thy sons my sons, and thy flock my flock, and all which thou hast is mine. And to my daughters what shall I do, to these this day or to their sons which they have borne? [44]And now, go to, let us cut a covenant, I and thou, and let it become a witness between me and thee.'

[45]And Jacob took a stone and raised it as a pillar. [46]And Jacob said to his brethren, 'Collect stones!' and they took stones, and made a heap, and ate there upon the heap. [47]And Laban called it 'Jegar-Sahadutha,' (*i.e.* 'Heap of Witness,' *Chald.*), and Jacob called it Galeed (*Gal-hed*, *i.e.* 'Heap of Witness,' *Heb.*). [48]And Laban said, 'This heap is a witness between me and thee this day. [50]If thou shalt afflict my daughters, and if thou shalt take wives upon my daughters, there is no man with us: see! Elohim is witness between me and thee.' [51]And Laban said to Jacob, 'Behold this heap, and behold this pillar, which I have thrown between me and thee! [52]This heap *is* witness, and the pillar *is* witness, (if) that I will not pass-over this heap unto thee, and (if) that thou wilt not pass-over this heap and this pillar unto me, for evil. [53]The Elohim of Abraham and the Elohim of Nahor judge between us, the Elohim of their father.' And Jacob sware by the Dread of his father Isaac.

[54]And Jacob sacrificed a sacrifice in the Mount, and called to his brethren to eat bread, and they ate bread, and spent-the-night in the Mount. [55]And Laban rose-early in the morning, and kissed his sons and his daughters, and blessed them; and Laban went and returned to his place.

**32.** [1]And Jacob went on his way, and angels of Elohim met him. [2]And Jacob said as he saw them, 'The Camp of Elohim is this!' and he called the name of that place Mahanaim (=two camps).

[13a]And he spent-the-night there on that night; [22]and he arose on that night, and passed-over the ford Jabbok. [24b]And there wrestled a man with him until the going up of the dawn. [25]And he saw that he prevailed not against him, and he touched upon the hollow of his thigh, and the hollow of Jacob's thigh was put-out in his wrestling with him. [26]And he said, 'Let me go, for the dawn has gone-up.' And he said, 'I will not let thee go except thou bless me.' [27]And he said unto him, 'What is thy name?' And he said, 'Jacob.' [28]And he said, 'Thy name shall not be called any-more Jacob, but Israel; for thou hast played-the-prince with Elohim and with men, and hast prevailed.' [29]And Jacob asked and said, 'Tell me, I pray, thy name?' And he said, 'Wherefore askest thou this about my name?' and he blessed him there. [30]And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel; 'for I have seen Elohim face unto face, and my soul is delivered.' [31]And the sun rose upon him as he passed Penuel, and he was halting upon his thigh. [32]Therefore the sons of Israel eat not the sinew which shrank, which is upon the hollow of the thigh until this day; for he touched upon the hollow of Jacob's thigh in the sinew that shrank.

**33.** [18]And Jacob came peacefully* to the city of Shechem which is in the land of Canaan at his coming out of Padan-Aram; and he encamped in front of the city. [19]And he bought a portion of the field, where he had spread his tent, out of the hand of the sons of Hamor, the father of Shechem, for a hundred kesitah. [20]And he set-up there an altar, and called it 'El, the Elohim of Israel.'

**34.** [1]And Dinah, Leah's daughter,† which she bare to Jacob, went forth to see among the daughters of the land. [2]And Shechem, son of Hamor the Hivite, prince of the country, saw her; and he took her and lay with her and humbled her. [3]And his soul clave to Dinah, Jacob's daughter, and he loved the lass, and spake upon the heart of the lass. [4]And Shechem said unto Hamor his father, saying, 'Take for me this girl for wife.' [5]And Jacob heard that he had defiled Dinah his daughter; and his sons were with his cattle in the field; and Jacob kept-silence until their coming.

[6]And Hamor, Shechem's father, went-forth unto Jacob, to speak with him. [7]And Jacob's sons came out of the field at their hearing *it*; and the men were grieved, and it was kindled to them greatly; because he had done folly in Israel‡ to lie with

---

* This refers to the language of Jacob's vow in xxviii.21(J²).

† Referring to the notice of Dinah's birth by E in xxx.21.

‡ This writer has already changed Jacob's name to 'Israel' in xxxii.28; but the phrase 'do folly in Israel' is evidently a mere reflection of the later time in which this passage was written. In fact, the expressions in this verse, 'he had done folly in Israel,' 'and so it is not done,' are almost identically repeated in the account of Amnon's forcing David's daughter Tamar, 2S.xiii.12, 'for it is not done so in Israel, do not this folly,'—and they occur together *nowhere else in the Bible.*

Jacob's daughter, and so it is not done. [8]And Hamor spake unto them, saying, 'Shechem, my son,—his soul longeth for your daughter; give her, I pray, to him for wife. [9]And intermarry with us: your daughters give to us, and take our daughters to you. [10]And with us shall ye dwell, and the land shall be before you; dwell, and trade, and get-possession in it.' [11]And Shechem said unto her father and unto her brethren, 'Let me find favour in your eyes: and what ye shall say unto me I will give. [12]Multiply upon me greatly dowry and gift, and I will give as ye shall say unto me; (and) but give me the lass for wife.'

[13]And the sons of Jacob answered Shechem and Hamor his father with guile, and spake, because he had defiled Dinah their sister, [14]and they said unto them, 'We cannot do this thing, to give our sister to a man uncircumcised; for that *is* a reproach to us. [15]Only on this will we consent to you, if ye will be as we, to be circumcised among you every male. [16]Then we will give our daughters to you, and your daughters we will take to us, and we will dwell with you, and we will become one people. [17]And, if ye will not hearken unto us to be circumcised, then we will take our daughter and go.'

[18]And their words were good in the eyes of Hamor, and in the eyes of Shechem Hamor's son. [19]And the lad delayed not to do the thing, for he delighted in Jacob's daughter: and he was honoured above all his father's house. [20]And Hamor came, and Shechem his son, unto the gate of their city, and they spake unto the men of their city, saying, [21]'These men, they are peaceable with us, and they shall dwell in the land, and trade in it; and the land, behold! it is wide on both hands before them; their daughters will we take to us for wives, and our daughters we will give to them. [22]Only on this will the men consent to us to dwell with us, to become one people, on there being circumcised among us every male, as they are circumcised.' [23]Their cattle, and their property, and all their beasts, shall they not be ours? Only let us consent to them, and they will dwell with us.' [24]And they hearkened unto Hamor and unto Shechem his son, all going-forth at the gate of his city; and they were circumcised every male, all going-forth at the gate of his city.

[25]And it came-to-pass on the third day, when they were sore, that two of the sons of Jacob, Simeon and Levi, Dinah's brothers, took each his sword, and came upo the city confidently, and slew every male. [26]And Hamor and Shechem his son they slew with the edge of the sword; and they took Dinah out of Shechem's house, and went forth. [27]The sons of Jacob came upon the slain, and plundered the city, because they had defiled their sister. [28]Their flocks and their herds and their he-asses, and what *was* in the city, and what *was* in the field, they took. [29]And all their might, and all their young-ones and their wives, they took-captive and plundered, and all that *was* in the house.

[30]And Jacob said unto Simeon and unto Levi, 'Ye have troubled me to make-me-to-stink with the inhabitant of the land, with the Canaanite and with the Perizzite: and I am men of number (=few in number); and they shall be gathered against me, and smite me, and I shall be destroyed, I and my house.' [31]And they said, 'As a harlot shall he (do) treat our daughter?'

**35.** [5]And they broke-up, and there was a terror of Elohim upon all the cities that were round-about them, and they did not pursue after the sons of Jacob. [6]And Jacob came to Luz, which is in the land of Canaan, he and all the people that was with him.* E(*v.*16[a],19,20[a]).

[21]And Israel broke-up and spread his tent beyond the tower of Edar. [22]And it-came-to-pass, while Israel dwelt in that land, that Reuben went and lay with Bilhah his father's concubine, and Israel heard *it*.

E(**35.**22[b]–29,**36.**1–19,31–35[abd],36–43,**37.**1,2[a]).

**37.** [2b]And Joseph brought their evil report unto their father. [3]And Israel loved Joseph above all his sons; for he was the son of his old-age to him; and he made him a (coat of the extremities) long coat. [4]And his brethren saw that their father loved him above all his brethren, and they could not speak to him for peace.

[5]And Joseph dreamed a dream, and told *it* to his brethren, and they added still to hate him. [6]And he said unto them, 'Hear, I pray, this dream which I have dreamed. [7]And behold! we were binding sheaves in the midst of the field, and behold! my sheaf arose, and also stood-up, and behold your sheaves were round-about, and bowed themselves to my sheaf.' [8]And his brethren said to him, 'Shalt thou indeed reign over us? Or shalt thou indeed rule among us?' And they added again to hate him for his dream and for his words.

[9]And he dreamed again another dream, and he recounted it to his brethren, and said, 'Behold! I have dreamed again a dream, and behold the sun and the moon and eleven stars bowing-themselves to me!' [10]And he recounted *it* unto his father, and unto his brethren, and his father rebuked him and said to him, 'What *is* this dream which thou hast dreamed? Shall we indeed come, I and thy mother and thy brethren, to bow-ourselves to thee to the ground?' [11]And his brethren were envious of him, and his father kept the matter.

[12]And his brethren went to tend their father's flock in Shechem. [13]And Israel said unto Joseph, 'Are not thy brethren feeding the flock in Shechem? Come, and I will send thee unto them.' And he said to him, 'Behold me!' [14]And he said to him 'Go, I pray, and see the peace of thy brothers and the peace of the flock, and bring-me-back-word.' And he sent him out of the vale of Hebron, and he came to Shechem.

[15]And a man found him, and behold! he *was* wandering in the field; and the man asked him saying, 'What seekest thou?' [16]And he said 'I am seeking my brothers: tell me, I pray thee, where they are feeding.' [17]And the man said, 'They have departed from this: for I heard them saying, Let us go to Dothan.' And Joseph went after his brothers, and found them in Dothan.

[18]And they saw him from a distance; and he had not yet come-near unto them,

---

* We suppose that *v.*9–15 was meant to have been cancelled for the reasons stated in (294). In *v.*6 J[2] has brought Jacob to *Luz*, which according to the same author, xxviii.19, was the old name of *Bethel*: and thus there is no breach of connection, when Jacob, according to E, sets off from Bethel in *v.*16[a].

(and) when they plotted against him to kill him. [19]And they said (a man to his brother) one to another, 'Behold! this lord of dreams cometh! [20]And now, come, and let us slay him, and cast him out into one of the pits, and let us say, an evil beast hath eaten him; and let us see what his dreams will be.' [21]And Reuben heard, and he delivered him out of their hand, and he said, 'Let us not smite him *in* soul.' [22]And Reuben said unto them, 'Shed not blood; cast him out into this pit which is in the wilderness, and put-not-out hand upon him,'—in order that he might deliver him out of their hand, to bring him back unto his father. [23]And it came-to-pass, as Joseph came unto his brethren, that they made Joseph put-off his coat, the long coat, which *was* upon him. [24]And they took him and cast him into the pit; and the pit was empty, there was no water in it. [25]And they sat-down to eat bread; and they lifted-up their eyes and saw, and behold! a caravan of Ishmaelites coming from Gilead, and their camels carrying spices, and balm, and myrrh, going to carry *it* down to Egypt. [26]And Judah said unto his brothers, 'What profit *will it be*, that we slay our brother, and cover-up his blood? [27]Come, and let us sell him to the Ishmaelites, and let our hand not be upon him; for our brother, our flesh is he.' And his brethren hearkened. E(*v.*28[a]); [28b]and they drew and took-up Joseph out of the pit, and they sold Joseph to the Ishmaelites [='Midianites,' *v.*28[a],36, as in Ju.viii.1,24,] for twenty *pieces* of silver, and they brought Joseph to Egypt.

[29]And Reuben returned unto the pit and behold! Joseph was not in the pit. And he rent his clothes, [30]and he returned unto his brothers and said, 'The child is not: and I—whither shall I go?' [31]And they took Joseph's coat, and slaughtered a goat, and dipped the coat in the blood. [32]And they sent the long coat, and brought *it* unto their father, and said, 'This have we found: recognise, I pray, *if it is* thy son's coat, or not?' [33]And he recognised it and said, 'It is my son's coat: an evil beast hath devoured him: Joseph is surely torn to pieces.' [34]And Jacob rent his vestments, and placed sackcloth upon his loins; and he mourned over his son many days. [35]And all his sons and all his daughters arose to comfort him, and he refused to comfort himself, and he said, 'Surely I shall go-down unto my son mourning into the grave': and his father wept for him. E(*v.*36).

J[1] (**40.**2,3[a],4,5[a],6–23,**41.**1–30). [31]And the plenty shall not be known in the land (before) by reason of that famine afterwards; for it *shall be* very heavy. J[1](*v.*32–34). [33]And let them collect all the food of these good years that are coming, and store under the hand of Pharaoh as food in the cities, and keep *it*. J[1](*v.*36–39). [40]Thou shalt be over my house, and at thy mouth shall all my people kiss: only in the throne will I be great above thee. [41]And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, 'See! I have (given) set thee over all the land of Egypt.' [42]And Pharaoh removed his ring from off his hand, and (gave) set it upon the hand of Joseph; and he clothed him with vestments of fine-linen, and placed the chain of gold upon his neck. [43]And made-him-ride in the second chariot which he had; and they called before him 'Abrech!' and he (gave) set him over all the land of Egypt. J[1](*v.*44,45).

[46]And Joseph was a son of thirty years at his standing before Pharaoh king of Egypt: and Joseph went-forth from before Pharaoh, and passed through in all the land of Egypt. J[1](*v.*47). [48]And he collected all the food of the seven years which

were in the land of Egypt, and he (gave) laid-up food in the cities: the food of the field of the city, which was round-about it, he (gave) laid-up in the midst thereof. [49]And Joseph stored corn as the sand of the sea very abundantly, until that he left-off to number, for there was no number.

[50]And to Joseph were born two sons before the year of famine came, which Asenath bare to him, daughter of Potipherah, priest of On. [51]And Joseph called the name of the elder 'Manasseh'; for 'Elohim hath made-me-forget all my toil and all my father's house.' [52]And the name of the second he called 'Ephraim': for 'Elohim hath fructified me in the land of my affliction.'

[53]And the seven years of plenty ended, which were in the land of Egypt. [54]And the seven years of famine began to come, according as Joseph said; and there was famine in all the lands, and in all the land of Egypt there was bread. [55]And all the land of Egypt was famished; and the people cried unto Pharaoh for bread: and Pharaoh said to all Egypt, 'Go unto Joseph: what he shall say to you, do.' J[1](*v.*56,57).

**42.** [1]And Jacob saw that there is grain in Egypt, and Jacob said to his sons, Wherefore look ye at one another?' [2]And he said, 'Behold! I have heard that there is grain in Egypt: go down thither, and purchase for us from thence, and we shall live and not die.' [3]And Joseph's ten brothers went down to purchase corn in Egypt. [4]And Benjamin, Joseph's brother, Jacob sent not with his brothers, for he said, 'Lest mischief befal him.' J[1](*v.*5,6[a]); [6b]and they bowed-themselves to him with their faces to the ground. J[1](*v.*7[a]); [7b]and he made-himself-strange unto them, and spake with them hardly, and said unto them, 'Whence have ye come?' And they said, 'From the land of Canaan to buy food.' [8]And Joseph recognised his brethren, and they did not recognise him. [9]And Joseph remembered the dreams which he had dreamed about them, and he said unto them, 'Spies are ye! to see the nakedness of the land have ye come.' [10]And they said unto him, 'No, my lord! (and) but thy servants have come to buy food. [11]We all are sons of one man: honest *are* we: thy servants have not been spies.' [12]And he said unto them, 'No! for the nakedness of the land have ye come to see.' [13]And they said, 'Thy servants are twelve: brethren *are* we, sons of one man in the land of Canaan: and behold! the youngest is with our father this day, and the one is not.' [14]And Joseph said unto them, 'That *is it* which I spake unto you, saying, Spies are ye! [15]By this shall ye be proved. Pharaoh's life! if ye shall go-forth out of this, except at the coming of your youngest brother hither. [16]Send one out of you, and he shall (take) fetch your brother, and ye shall be bound, and your words shall be proved, whether truth *is* with you: and if not, Pharaoh's life! surely ye *are* spies.'

[17]And he gathered them into ward three days. [18]And Joseph said unto them on the third day, 'This do ye, and live: ELOHIM I fear. [19]If honest *are* ye, let your brother, one, be bound in the house of your ward, and ye, go ye, carry grain (of) for the famine of your houses. [20]And your youngest brother bring unto me, and your words shall be verified, and ye shall not die.' And they did so. [21]And they said, one to his brother, 'Verily guilty *are* we concerning our brother, whose anguish of soul we saw, at his making entreaty unto us, and we did not hear: therefore there

has come unto us this anguish.' [22]And Reuben answered them, saying, 'Said I not unto you, saying, Do not sin by the child, and ye did not hear? And also his blood, behold! it is required.' [23]And they knew not that Joseph *was* hearing: for the interpreter *was* between them. [24]And he turned-around from them and wept; and he returned to them, and spake unto them, and took out of them Simeon, and bound him before their eyes.

[25]And Joseph commanded, and they filled their vessels with corn, and to return their money of (man) each into his sack, and to give them provision for the way; and he did to them so. [26]And they carried their grain upon their asses, and went from thence. [27]And the one opened his sack to give provender to his ass at the inn, and he saw his money, and behold! it was in the mouth of his bag. [28]And he said unto his brethren, 'My money is returned! and also behold! *it is* in my bag!' and their heart went-forth, and they were in-terror, one unto his brother, saying, 'What *is* this Elohim hath done to us?'

[29]And they came unto Jacob their father to the land of Canaan, and they told to him all the *things* which befel them, saying, [30]'The man, the lord of the land, spake with us hard *things*, and (gave) set us as spies of the land. [31]And we said unto him, Honest *are* we; we have not been spies. [32]Twelve *are* we, brethren, sons of our father; the one is not, and the youngest this day *is* with our father in the land of Canaan. [33]And the man, the lord of the land, said unto us, By this shall I know that honest *are* ye: your brother, the one, leave with me, and *for* the famine of your houses take ye and go. [34]And bring your youngest brother unto me, and I shall know that ye *are* not spies—that honest *are* ye; your brother will I give to you, and ye shall trade *in* the land.' [35]And it came-to-pass, they *were* emptying their sacks, and, behold! *for* (man) each a bundle of his silver in his sack! and they saw the bundles of their silver, they and their father, and feared. [36]And Jacob their father said unto them, 'Me have ye bereaved: Joseph is not! and Simeon is not! and Benjamin ye will take! against me have been all these things.' [37]And Reuben said unto his father, saying, 'My two sons shalt thou put-to-death, if I bring him not unto thee: give him upon my hand, and I will bring him back unto thee.' [38]And he said, 'My son shall not go down with you, for his brother *is* dead, and he is left by himself; and, should mischief befall him in the way in which ye shall go, (and) then will ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave.'

**43.** [1]And the famine was heavy in the land. [2]And it came-to-pass, as they had finished to eat the grain which they brought out of Egypt, (and) that their father said unto them, 'Return, buy for us a little food.' [3]And Judah said unto him, saying, 'The man protested vehemently among us, saying, Ye shall not see my face except your brother be with you. [4]If thou art for sending our brother with us, we will go down and buy for thee food. [5]And if thou art not for sending, we will not go down: for the man said unto us, Ye shall not see my face, except your brother be with you.' [6]And Israel said, 'Wherefore have ye done evil to me, to tell the man whether you had still a brother?' [7]And they said, 'The man asked closely about us and about our kindred, saying, Is your father still alive? Have you still a brother? and we told him (at the mouth of=) according to these words. Could we certainly

know that he would say, Bring down your brother?' [8]And Judah said unto Israel his father, 'Send the lad with me, and we will arise and go, and we shall live and not die, (also) both we, (also) and thou, (also) and our little-ones. [9]I will guarantee him; from my hand shalt thou seek him: if I do not bring him back unto thee, and set him before thee, then I shall have sinned to thee (all the days) for ever. [10]For, unless we had loitered, truly now we had returned this twice.' [11]And Israel their father said unto them, 'If it *must be* so now, this do ye: take of the (song) best of the land in your vessels, and carry down to the man a present, a little balm, and a little honey, spices and myrrh, pistachio-nuts and almonds. [12]And (silver of the second) a second supply of silver take in your hand, and the silver that was brought back in the mouth of your bags shall ye take-back in your hand: perhaps, it *was* a mistake. [13]And take your brother, and arise, return unto the man. [14]And El Shaddai give you (bowels) tender-mercies before the man, (and) that he may put-forth to you your other brother and Benjamin: and I, as I am bereaved, am bereaved.'

[15]And the men took this present, and a second *supply* of money they took in their hand and Benjamin; and they arose, and went down to Egypt, and stood before Joseph. [16]And Joseph saw them with Benjamin, and said to *him* who *was* over his house, 'Bring the men to the house, and slaughter beasts, and prepare, for the men will eat with me at noon.' [17]And the man did as Joseph said, and the man brought the men to Joseph's house. [18]And the men feared, for that they were brought to Joseph's house, and they said, 'For the matter of the silver, which returned in our bags at the beginning, are we brought, to roll upon us, and to fall upon us, and take us for servants, and our asses.' [19]And they came-near unto the man who *was* over Joseph's house, and they spake unto him in the entrance of the house. [20]And they said, 'Oh, my lord! we came-down certainly at the beginning to buy food. [21]And it came-to-pass that we came unto the inn, and opened our bags, and behold! the silver of *each* man in the mouth of his bag—our silver in its weight! and we have brought it back in our hand. [22]And other silver have we brought down in our hand to buy food. We know not who placed our silver in our bags.' [23]And he said, 'Peace *be* to you! fear not: your Elohim and the Elohim of your father hath given you hidden treasure in your bags. Your money came unto me.' And he brought out unto them Simeon.

[24]And the man brought the men to Joseph's house, and gave water, and they washed their feet, and he gave fodder to their asses. [25]And they prepared the present, until Joseph's coming at noon; for they heard that there they would eat bread. [26]And Joseph came to the house, and they brought to him the present, which *was* in their hand, to the house, and bowed-themselves to him to the earth. [27]And he asked of them about (peace) *their* welfare, and said, 'Is there peace *with* your aged father whom ye (said) spake of? Is he still alive?' [28]And they said, 'There is peace to thy servant, to our father; he is still alive': and they bowed-the-head, and bowed themselves. [29]And he lifted-up his eyes, and saw Benjamin his brother, the son of his mother; and he said, 'Is this your youngest brother which ye (said) spake of unto me?' and he said, 'Elohim be-gracious-unto thee, my son!' [30]And Joseph hastened, for his bowels burned unto his brother; and he sought to weep, and went

to the inner-chamber, and wept there. [31]And he washed his face, and came-out, and refrained himself; and he said, 'Place bread.' [32]And they placed for him by himself, and for them by themselves, and for the Egyptians, who ate with him, by themselves; for the Egyptians could not eat bread with the Hebrews; for that *is* an abomination to Egyptians. [33]And they sat before him, the first-born according to his birth-right, and the minor according to his minority: and the men wondered each (man) to his fellow. [34]And he sent messes from before him unto them, and Benjamin's mess was greater than the messes of all of them five (hands) times; and they drank and quaffed with him.

**44.** [1]And he commanded *him* who *was* over his house, saying, 'Fill the sacks of the men with food as they shall be able to bear, and *place each* man's silver in the mouth of his bag. [2]And my cup, the cup of silver, shalt thou place in the mouth of the bag of the youngest, and the silver of his grain.' And he did according to the word which Joseph spake.

[3]The morning was light, and the men were sent forth, they and their asses. [4]They went-out from the city, they were not far-off, and Joseph said to *him* who *was* over his house, 'Arise, pursue after the men, and overtake them, and say unto them, Wherefore have ye rewarded evil instead of good? [5]Is not this *that* by which my lord drinks, and by which he certainly divines? Ye have done evil what ye have done.'

[6]And he overtook them and spake unto them these words. [7]And they said unto him, 'Wherefore speaketh my lord according to these words? Far-be-it to thy servants from doing according to this thing! [8]Behold! the silver, which we found in the mouth of our bags, we brought back unto thee out of the land of Canaan: and how shall we steal out of the house of thy lord silver or gold? [9]With whomsoever of thy servants it is found, both let him die, and we also will become servants to my lord.' [10]And he said, 'Now also, according to your words, so *be* it! With whomsoever it is found, he shall be servant to me, and you shall be innocent.'

[11]And they hastened and let-down *each* man his bag to the ground, and they opened *each* man his sack. [12]And he searched, he began by the eldest and by the youngest he ended; and the cup was found in Benjamin's bag. [13]And they rent their vestments, and laded *each* man upon his ass, and they returned to the city. [14]And Judah went, and his brethren, to Joseph's house—and he was still there,—and he fell upon his face to the earth. [15]And Joseph said to them, 'What is this work which ye have done? Knew ye not that a man such as I would certainly divine?' [16]And Judah said, 'What shall we say to my lord? What shall we speak? And *with* what shall we justify-ourselves? Elohim hath found-out the iniquity of thy servants. Behold we *are* servants to my lord, (also) both we, (also) and *he* in whose hand the cup is found.' [17]And he said, 'Far-be-it to me from doing this! The man, in whose hand the cup is found, he shall be servant to me, and ye—go up in peace unto your father.'

[18]And Judah drew-near unto him, and said, 'Oh, my lord! let, I pray, thy servant speak a word in the ears of my lord, and let not thine anger be kindled against thy servant: for thou *art* as Pharaoh. [19]My lord asked his servants,

saying, (Is there to you) Have you a father or a brother? [20]And he said unto my lord, (There is to us) We have an aged father, and a young child of his old age, and his brother is dead, and there is left he only of his mother, and his father loveth him. [21]And thou saidst unto thy servants, Bring him down unto me, and I will (place) set my eye upon him. [22]And we said unto my lord, The youth is not able to leave his father, and, should he leave his father, (and) then would *his father* die. [23]And thou saidst unto thy servants, If thy youngest brother come not down with you, ye shall not (add to see) see again my face. [24]And it came-to-pass that we went-up unto thy servant my father, and we told him the words of my lord. [25]And our father said, Return, buy for us a little food. [26]And we said, We cannot go-down; if our youngest brother be with us, (and) then we will go-down; for we are not able to see the man's face, and our youngest brother not being with us. [27]And thy servant my father said unto us, Ye know that my wife bare to me twain. [28]And the one went forth from me, and I said, Surely he is certainly torn-in-pieces, and I have not seen him unto this. [29]And should ye take also this one from my face, and mischief befall him, (and) then will ye bring down my gray-hairs with evil to the grave. [30]And now, when I come unto thy servant my father, and the youth not *being* with us, and his soul being bound up in his son, [31](and) then it will come-to-pass, when he sees that the youth is not, (and) then he will die, and thy servants will bring-down the gray-hairs of thy servant our father with sorrow to the grave. [32]For thy servant guaranteed the lad (from) to my father, saying, If I bring him not back unto thee, (and) then shall I have sinned to my father (and all the days) for ever. [33]And now let thy servant, I pray, dwell instead of the youth a servant to my lord, and let the youth go-up with his brethren. [34]For how shall I go-up unto my father, and the youth not with me? lest I see the evil that shall find my father.'

**45.** [1]And Joseph was not able to refrain himself (to) before all those standing by him, and he called, 'Put-out every man from me!' And there stood not *any* man with him, at Joseph's making-himself-known unto his brethren. [2]And he gave *out* his voice in weeping, and the Egyptians heard, and the house of Pharaoh heard. [3]And Joseph said unto his brethren, 'I *am* Joseph! Is my father still alive?' And his brethren were not able to answer him; for they were confounded (from before him) at his presence. [4]And Joseph said unto his brethren, 'Come near, I pray, unto me,' and they came near; and he said, 'I *am* Joseph your brother, whom ye sold into Egypt. [5]And now be not grieved, and let it not be kindled in your eyes, that ye sold me hither; for for life-saving Elohim sent me before you. [6]For these two years the famine *is* in the midst of the land; and still *there are* five years *in* which shall be no ploughing nor harvest. [7]And Elohim sent me before you to place for you a remnant in the land, and to save-life to you for a great deliverance. [8]And now you did not send me hither, (for) but ELOHIM; and He hath placed me for a father to Pharaoh, and for lord to all his house and ruler in all the land of Egypt. [9]Hasten, and go-up unto my father, and ye shall say unto him, Thus said thy son Joseph, Elohim hath placed me for lord to all Egypt; come-down unto me; do not (stand) stay. [10]And thou shalt dwell in the land of Goshen, and thou shalt be near unto me, thou, and thy sons, and thy sons' sons, and thy flocks,

and thy herds, and all thine. [11]And I will nourish thee there, for still *there are* five years of famine; lest thou be made-destitute, thou, and thy house, and all thine. [12]And, behold! your eyes *are* seeing, and the eyes of my brother Benjamin, that *it is* my mouth that speaketh unto you. [13]And ye shall tell my father all my glory in Egypt, and all which ye have seen, and ye shall hasten, and bring down my father hither.'

[14]And he fell upon his brother Benjamin's neck and wept, and Benjamin wept upon his neck. [15]And he kissed all his brethren, and wept upon them, and afterwards his brethren spake with him.

J[1](*v.*16–18). [19]'And thou—thou art commanded, this do ye: take for you from the land of Egypt wagons for your little-ones and for your wives, and carry your father, and come. [20]And let not your eye spare upon your vessels; for the good of all the land of Egypt it is yours.'

J[1](*v.*21[a]): [21b]and Joseph gave them wagons according to the mouth of Pharaoh, and he gave to them provisions for the way. [22]To all of them he gave, to *each* man changes of vestments; and to Benjamin he gave three hundred of silver, and five changes of vestments. [23]And to his father he sent according to this—ten asses carrying of the good of Egypt, and ten she-asses carrying corn, and bread, and food, for his father for the way. [24]And he sent-forth his brothers and they went, and he said unto them, 'Do not quarrel in the way.'

[25]And they went-up out of Egypt, and they came to the land of Canaan unto Jacob their father. [26]And they told him, saying, 'Joseph is still living,' and that he *was* ruling in all the land of Egypt: and his heart fainted, for he did not believe them. [27]And they spake unto him all the words of Joseph, which he spake unto them, and he saw the wagons which Joseph had sent to carry him, and the spirit of Jacob their father lived. [28]And Israel said, 'Enough! Joseph my son is still living; I will go and see him before I die.'

**46.** [1]And Israel removed and all his, and came to Beersheba; and he sacrificed sacrifices to the Elohim of his father Isaac. [2]And Elohim said to Israel in visions of the night, and said, 'Jacob! Jacob!' and he said, 'Behold me!' [3]And He said 'I am EL, the Elohim of thy father: fear not (from) so as not to go-down to Egypt: for I will set thee for a great nation there. [4]I will go down with thee to Egypt, and I also will surely bring-thee-up: and Joseph shall place his hand upon thine eyes.' [5]And Jacob arose from Beersheba; and the sons of Israel carried Jacob their father, and their little-ones, and their wives, in the wagons which Pharaoh sent to carry him. E(*v.*6–12[a],13–20[ac]), [20b]which Asenath daughter of Potipherah, priest of On, bare to him. E(*v.*21–26[abd]), [26c]besides Jacob's sons' wives. E(*v.*27).

[28]And Judah he sent before him unto Joseph, to instruct before his face to Goshen; and they came to the land of Goshen. [29]And Joseph (bound) yoked his chariot, and went-up to meet Israel his father to Goshen, and he appeared to him, and fell upon his neck, and wept still upon his neck. [30]And Israel said unto Joseph, 'Let me die this time, after my seeing thy face: for thou art still alive.' [31]And Joseph said unto his brethren and unto his father's house, 'I will go-up, and

tell Pharaoh, and say unto him, My brethren and my father's house, which were in the land of Canaan, have come unto me. [32]And the men *are* feeders of sheep, for men of cattle have they been; and their flocks and their herds, and all theirs, have they brought.' [33]And it shall be, when Pharaoh shall call to you, and shall say, What is your work? [34](and) that ye shall say, Men of cattle have thy servants been, from our youth and until now, (also) both we (also) and our fathers,—in order that ye may dwell in the land of Goshen; for all feeders of sheep are an abomination of the Egyptians.'

**47.** [1]And Joseph came, and told Pharaoh, and said, 'My father, and my brethren, and their flocks and their herds, and all theirs, have come out of the land of Canaan, and behold! *they are* in the land of Goshen. [2]And from the (end) whole of his brethren he took five men, and set them before Pharaoh. [3]And Pharaoh said unto his brethren, 'What is your work?' And they said unto Pharaoh, 'Feeders of sheep are thy servants (also) both we (also) and our fathers.' [4]And they said unto Pharaoh, 'To sojourn in the land have we come: for there is no pasture for the sheep which *belong* to thy servants, for the famine is heavy in the land of Canaan: and now let thy servants dwell, I pray, in the land of Goshen.' [5]And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, saying, 'Thy father and thy brethren have come unto thee. [6]The land of Egypt—it is before thee; in the best of the land (make to dwell) settle thy father and thy brethren; let them dwell in the land of Goshen: and if thou knowest, and there are among them men of ability, (and) then shalt thou set them as cattle-masters over what is mine.'

E(*v.*7–11[abd]), [11cc]in the best of the land, as Pharaoh commanded. [12]And Joseph nourished his father and his brethren, and all his father's house with bread, according to the mouth of the little-ones.

[13]And bread there was none in all the land; for the famine was very heavy, and the land of Egypt fainted, and the land of Canaan, by reason of the famine. [14]And Joseph collected all the silver, which was found in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan, (by) for the grain which they *were* buying; and Joseph brought the silver to Pharaoh's house. [15]And the silver was finished out of the land of Egypt and out of the land of Canaan; and all the Egyptians came unto Joseph saying, 'Give-here to us bread! and wherefore shall we die over-against thee? for the silver has come-to-an-end.' [16]And Joseph said, 'Give-here your cattle, and I will give you for your cattle, if the silver has come-to-an-end.' [17]And they brought their cattle unto Joseph; and Joseph gave them bread for the horses, and for the cattle of flocks, and for the cattle of herds, and for the he-asses: and he led them on with the bread for all their cattle in that year. [18]And that year was finished, and they came unto him in the second year, and said to him, 'We will not conceal from my lord that the silver has been finished, and the cattle of beasts, unto my lord; there is (not) nothing left before my lord, except our carcases and our ground. [19]Wherefore shall we die before thine eyes, (also) both we (also) and our ground. Buy us and our grounds for the bread, and we and our grounds will be servants to Pharaoh; and give seed, and we shall live and not die, and the ground will not be desolate.'

[20]And Joseph bought all the ground of Egypt for Pharaoh; for the Egyptians sold (man) each his field, for the famine was strong upon them,—and the land became Pharaoh's. [21]And the people—he passed-it-over to cities, from (end of the border of Egypt unto its end=) from one end of Egypt to the other. [22]Only the ground of the priests he bought not; for *there was* a (statute) stated-allowance to the priests from Pharaoh, and they ate the stated-allowance which Pharaoh gave them: therefore they did not sell their ground. [23]And Joseph said unto the people, 'Behold! I have bought you this day and your ground for Pharaoh: lo! *there is* seed for you, and ye shall sow the ground. [24]And it shall come-to-pass by the produce (and) that ye shall give a fifth to Pharaoh, and the four (hands) parts shall be yours, for seed of the field, and for your food, and for *those* who *are* in your houses, and for food for your little-ones.' [25]And they said, 'Thou hast saved us alive: let us find favour in the eyes of my lord, and let us be servants to Pharaoh.' [26]And Joseph (placed) made it for a statute unto this day (over) concerning the ground of Egypt, 'to Pharaoh for the fifth': only the ground of the priests (by themselves) alone became not Pharaoh's.

[27]And Israel dwelt in the land of Egypt, in the land of Goshen, and they got possessions in it, E(*v.*27$^b$,28).

[29]And Israel's days drew near to die; and he called to his son, to Joseph, and said to him, 'If, I pray, I have found favour in thine eyes, place, I pray, thine hand under my thigh, and do with me mercy and truth: bury me not, I pray, in Egypt. [30]And I will lie with my fathers, and thou shalt bear me out of Egypt, and bury me in their burying-place.' And he said, 'I will do according to thy word.' [31]And he said, 'Swear to me'; and he sware to him; and Israel bowed-himself upon the bed's head.

**48.** [1]And it came-to-pass after these things, (and) that *one* said to Joseph, 'Behold! thy father is sick.' And he took his two sons with him, Manasseh and Ephraim. [2]And *one* told Jacob, and said, 'Behold! thy son Joseph hath come unto thee:' and Israel strengthened-himself, and sat upon the bed.*

[8]And Israel saw the sons of Joseph, and said, 'Who are these?' [9]And Joseph said unto his father, 'My sons are these, whom Elohim gave to me in this *land*.' And he said, '(Take) Bring them, I pray, unto me, and I will bless them.' [10]And Israel's eyes were heavy from old age; he was not able to see; and he brought them near unto him, and he kissed them, and embraced them. [11]And Israel said unto Joseph, 'To see thy face I had not concluded; and behold! Elohim hath made me see thy seed also.'

[12]And Joseph brought them out from between his thighs, and he bowed himself on his face to the ground. [13]And Joseph took the two, Ephraim in his right-hand on Israel's left-hand, and Manasseh in his left-hand on Israel's right-hand, and he brought *them* near unto him. [14]And Israel put-out his right-hand, and set *it* upon the head of Ephraim, and he *was* the younger, and his left upon the head of

* We suppose that *v.*3–7 was meant to have been cancelled for the reasons stated in (294).

Manasseh, directing-wittingly his hands, for Manasseh was the first-born. [15]And he blessed Joseph, and said, 'ELOHIM, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac walked, ELOHIM, who fed me since my being unto this day, [16]the Angel who redeemed me from all evil, bless the youths! and (by) through them shall my name be called, and the name of my fathers, Abraham and Isaac; and they shall swarm-as-fish for multitude in the midst of the land.'

[17]And Joseph saw that his father set his right-hand upon Ephraim's head, and it was evil in his eyes; and he took-hold of his father's hand to remove it from off the head of Ephraim upon the head of Manasseh. [18]And Joseph said unto his father, 'Not so, my father! for this *is* the first-born: place thy right-hand upon his head.' [19]And his father refused, and said, 'I know, my son, I know: he also shall become a people, and he also shall be great: and, nevertheless, his younger brother shall be great above him, and his seed shall be the fulness of nations.' [20]And he blessed them in that day, saying, 'By thee shall Israel bless, saying, Elohim (place) make thee as Ephraim and as Manasseh!' And he placed Ephraim before Manasseh.

[21]And Israel said unto Joseph, 'Behold! I *am* dying: and Elohim will be with you, and bring you back unto the land of your fathers. [22]And I give to thee one (*Shechem*) shoulder (upon) above thy brethren, which I took out of the hand of the Amorite by my sword and by my bow.'

**49.** E(*v.*1[a]), [1b]and said, 'Gather yourselves together, and I will tell you what shall meet with you in the future of days.

[2]Assemble yourselves, and hear, ye sons of Jacob,
And hearken to Israel your father!
[3]REUBEN, my first-born thou,
My might, and the firstling of my strength.
Excellency of dignity, and excellency of power!
[4]Bubbling like water, do not thou excel;
For thou ascendedst thy father's bed;
Then defiledst thou my couch ascending.
[5]SIMEON and LEVI—brethren!
Instruments of violence *are* their weapons;
[6]In their council come not thou, my soul!
In their company be not thou united, my honour!
For in their anger they slew a man,
And in their wilfulness they houghed an ox.
[7]Cursed *be* their anger, for *it was* strong,
And their excess, for *it was* hard;
I will portion them out in Jacob,
And I will scatter them in Israel.
[8]JUDAH, thou! thy brethren shall praise thee;
Thy hand is on the neck of thy foes;
Thy father's sons shall bow to thee.
[9]A lion's whelp is JUDAH,

Ravaging the young of the suckling-ewes;
He stooped, he couched, as a lion;
And as a lioness,—who shall rouse him?
[10]The sceptre shall not depart from JUDAH,
Nor the rod from between his feet,
Until he come to Shiloh,
And to him *be* the obedience of peoples.
[11]Binding to the vine his ass-colt,
And to the vine-branch the young of his she-ass,—
He shall wash with wine his vesture,
And with the blood of grapes his dress,—
[12]Dark in the eyes with wine,
And white in the teeth with milk.
[13]ZEBULUN—at the coast of seas shall he abide,—
[And that is the coast of merchantmen, (21-0,*note*)]
And his side upon Zidon.
[14]ISSACHAR—an ass of bone,
Couching between the folds;
[15]And he saw rest, that *it was* good,
And the land, that *it was* pleasant;
And he let-down his shoulder to bear,
And became a tributary servant.
[16]DAN—he shall judge (*dan*) his people,
As one of the (sceptres) tribes of Israel.
[17]Let Dan be a serpent upon the way,
A viper upon the path;
That biteth the heels of the horse,
And his rider falleth backward.
[18]For Thy salvation do I long, Jehovah!
[19]GAD—a press-of-people (*gèdud*) shall press (*gud*) him;
And he shall press (*gud*) the (heel) rear.
[20]ASHER*—his bread shall be fat,
And he shall (give dainties of a king) yield royal dainties.
[21]NAPHTALI—a hind (sent) let-go,
That giveth words of pleasantness.
[22]A fruitful branch is JOSEPH,
A fruitful branch by a spring;
The sprouts mount over the wall.

---

* The מ, which stands in our Hebrew Bibles at the beginning of *v.*20,—מֵאָשֵׁר, 'Out of Asher'—belongs most probably to the end of *v.*19, עֲקֵבָם, 'their heel.' It is not expressed in *v.*20 in any of the old translations, and, by omitting it, the blessing on Asher begins, like the other blessings, with the name of the tribal ancestor.

[23]And they embittered him, and strove with him,
And hated him, the lords of arrows.
[24]Yet his bow abode in permanence,
And the arms of his hands were made strong,
From the hands of the Mighty-One of Jacob;
From thence is the shepherd, the stone of Israel!
[25]From thy father's El, and He shall help thee,
And El Shaddai, and He shall bless thee,—
Blessings of the heavens from above,
Blessings of the deep couching beneath,
Blessings of the breasts and of the womb.
[26]Thy father's blessings have prevailed
Above the blessings of the eternal mountains,
Above the delight of the everlasting hills.
May they be upon the head of Joseph,
And on the crown of the pre-eminent of his brethren
[27]BENJAMIN—a wolf shall ravin!
In the morn he shall devour prey,
And at even he shall portion out spoil.

[28]All these *were* the twelve tribes of Israel, and this *is* what their father spake to them, and blessed them; as to (man) each, what *was* according to his blessing, he blessed them.

**50.** [1]And Joseph fell upon his father's face, and wept upon him, and kissed him. [2]And Joseph commanded his servants, the physicians, to embalm his father; and the physicians embalmed Israel. [3]And forty days were fulfilled for him; for so are fulfilled the days of the embalmers; and the Egyptians wept for him seventy days.

[4]And the days of his weeping passed, and Joseph spake unto the house of Pharaoh, saying, 'If, I pray, I have found favour in your eyes, speak, I pray, in the ears of Pharaoh, saying, [5]My father hath sworn me saying, Behold! I *am* dying: in my burying-place, which I have hewed-out for me in the land of Canaan, there shalt thou bury me; and now let me go-up, I pray, and bury my father, and return.' [6]And Pharaoh said, 'Go-up, and bury thy father, as he hath sworn thee.'

[7]And Joseph went-up to bury his father, and there went-up with him all the servants of Pharaoh, elders of his house, and all the elders of the land of Egypt. [8]And all the house of Joseph, and his brethren, and his father's house: only their little-ones, and their flocks, and their herds, they left in the land of Goshen. [9]And there went-up with him (also) both chariots (also) and horsemen; and the camp was very (heavy) great. [10]And they came unto the floor of Atad, which is beyond the Jordan, and they lamented there a great and very heavy lamentation; and he made for his father a mourning of seventy days. [11]And the dweller of the land, the Canaanite, saw the mourning in the floor of Atad; and they said, 'A heavy

mourning *is* this to the Egyptians!' Therefore (he) one called its name Abel-Mizraim (= 'mourning of the Egyptians'), which *is* beyond the Jordan.

[12]And his sons did to him so as he had commanded them. E(*v.*13). [14]And Joseph returned to Egypt, he and his brethren and all that went-up with him to bury his father, after his burying his father.

[15]And Joseph's brethren feared, for their father was dead, and they said, 'Perhaps, Joseph will hate us, and will surely return to us all the evil which we have wrought him. [16]And they (commanded=) commissioned *a messenger* to Joseph, saying, 'Thy father commanded before his death, saying, [17]Thus shall ye say to Joseph, Oh! Forgive, I pray thee, the transgression of thy brethren and their sin, for they have wrought thee evil. And now forgive, I pray, the transgression of the servants of the Elohim of thy father.' And Joseph wept at their speaking unto him. [18]And his brethren also went, and fell before his face, and said, 'Behold us for servants to thee!' [19]And Joseph said unto them, 'Fear not: for *am* I instead of Elohim?' [20]And you—ye reckoned evil against me; Elohim reckoned it for good, in order to do as at this day, to save-alive much people. [21]And now fear not! I will nourish you and your little-ones.' And he comforted them, and spake upon their heart.

[22]And Joseph dwelt in Egypt, he and the house of his father; and Joseph lived a hundred and ten years. [23]And Joseph saw for Ephraim the sons of the third *generation*: also the sons of Machir the son of Manasseh were born upon Joseph's knees. [24]And Joseph said unto his brethren, 'I *am* dying, and Elohim will surely visit you, and will bring you up out of this land unto the land which He sware to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob.' [25]And Joseph sware the sons of Israel, saying, 'Elohim will surely visit you, and ye shall bring-up my bones from this.' [26]And Joseph died, a son of hundred and ten years: and they embalmed him. and he was placed in the coffin in Egypt.

---

## THE THIRD SET OF JEHOVISTIC INSERTIONS ($J^3$),

*in the latter part of David's reign.*

E(**1.1–2.4**[a]), [4b]in the day of JEHOVAH-ELOHIM'S making Earth and Heaven. [5]And no plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no shrub of the field yet sprouted; for JEHOVAH-ELOHIM had not made-it-rain on the earth, and man *was* not, to till the ground. [6]And a mist rose from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground.

[7]And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM formed the man of dust out of the ground, and breathed in his nostrils breath of life, and the man became a living soul. [8]And JEHOVAH-

ELOHIM planted a garden in Eden eastward, and placed there the man whom He had formed. 9And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM made-to-sprout out of the ground every tree pleasant for sight and good for food, and the tree of life in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

10And a river goeth out from Eden to water the garden, and from thence it is separated, and becomes four heads. 11The name of the first *is* Pison; that *is it* which boundeth the whole land of Havilah, where *is* the gold; 12and the gold of that land *is* good; there is the bdellium and the onyx-stone. And the name of the second river is Gihon: that *is it* which boundeth the whole land of Cush. 14And the name of the third river is Hiddekel; that *is it* which goeth eastward of Assyria. And the fourth river—that *is* Euphrates.

15And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM took the man, and left him in the garden of Eden, to till it and to keep it. 16And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM enjoined upon the man, saying, 'Of every tree of the garden freely thou shalt eat. 17But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil—thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day of thy eating of it thou shalt surely die.'

18And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM said, '*It is* not good, the man's being alone-by-himself: I will make for him a help over-against him.' 19And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM formed out of the ground every animal of the field and every fowl of the heaven, and brought *it* to the man, to see what he would call it; and whatsoever the man would call it, the living soul,—that *should be* its name. 20And the man called names to all the cattle, and to the fowl of the heaven, and to every animal of the field; but for the man (he) one found not a help over-against him.

21And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM made-to-fall a deep slumber upon the man, and he slept; and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh in-its-place. 22And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM built the rib, which He took out of the man, into a woman, and brought her to the man. 23And the man said, 'This-time this *is* bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: to this it shall be called Woman (*Ishah*), for out of Man (*Ish*) was this taken. 24Therefore shall a man forsake his father and his mother, and cleave unto his wife, and they shall become one flesh.' 25And they were both of them naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.

**3.** 1And the serpent was subtle, above every animal of the field, which JEHOVAH-ELOHIM had made: and he said unto the woman, '*Is it* so that ELOHIM has said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?' 2And the woman said unto the serpent, 'Of the fruit of the trees of the garden we shall eat. 3But of the fruit of the tree, which *is* in the midst of the garden, ELOHIM has said, Ye shall not eat of it, and ye shall not touch it, lest ye die.' 4And the serpent said unto the woman, 'Ye shall not surely die. 5For ELOHIM knows that, in the day of your eating of it, your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as ELOHIM, knowing good and evil.' 6And the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a longing to the eyes, and the tree was pleasant to behold; and she took of its fruit, and ate, and gave also to her husband with her, and he ate. 7And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed together fig-leaves, and made to themselves girdles.

[8]And they heard the (voice) sound of JEHOVAH-ELOHIM, walking in the garden in the wind of the day; and he hid himself, the man and his wife, from the face of JEHOVAH-ELOHIM in the midst of the trees of the garden. [9]And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM called unto the man, and said to him, 'Where art thou?' [10]And he said, 'Thy (voice) sound I heard in the garden, and I feared, for I *am* naked, and I hid myself.' [11]And He said, 'Who told to thee that thou *art* naked? Of the tree, which I commanded thee not to eat of, hast thou eaten?' [12]And the man said, 'The woman, whom Thou didst (give) set with me, she gave to me of the tree, and I ate.' [13]And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM said to the woman, 'What *is* this *which* thou hast done?' And the woman said, 'The serpent beguiled me, and I ate.'

[14]And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM said unto the serpent, 'Because thou hast done this, cursed *art* thou above all the cattle and above every animal of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. [15]And enmity will I put between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thee *on* the head and thou shalt bruise it* *on* the heel.'

[16]Unto the woman He said, 'I will multiply exceedingly thy pain and thy conception; in pain shalt thou bear children, and unto thy husband *shall be* thy desire, and he shall rule over thee.'

[17]And to Adam He said, 'Because thou hast listened to the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, *as to* which I commanded thee, saying, 'Thou shalt not eat of it,' cursed *is* the ground for thy sake; in pain shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; [18]and thorns and thistles shall it make-to-sprout to thee, and thou shalt eat of the herb of the field. [19]In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread until thy returning unto the ground, for out of it wast thou taken; for dust *art* thou, and unto dust shalt thou return.'

[20]And the man called the name of his wife Eve (*Khavvah*), for she was the mother of all living (*khay*).

[21]And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM made to Adam and to his wife coats of skin, and clothed them. [22]And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM said, 'Behold! the man has become as one of us, for the knowledge of good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever. . .'[23]And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM put him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. [24]And he drove-away the man, and stationed eastward of the garden of Eden the cherubs and the flame of the turning sword, to keep the way of the tree of life.

**4.** [1]And the man knew Eve his wife, and she conceived and bare (*Kain*) Cain, and she said, 'I have acquired (*Kanithi*), a man with JEHOVAH.' [2]And she added

---

* The E. V. has '*his* heel'; but '*his*' is here only the antiquated form of '*its*,' as is plain from the E. V. having just before '*It* shall bruise &c.'

The Heb. word for 'seed' is a *collective* noun, and is never found in the *plural* in the general sense of 'offspring.' Hence it *may* be used here for 'offspring,' generally, and must not be pressed as meaning an *individual*, unless the context requires it, as in iv.25.

to bear his brother Abel; and Abel was a tender of sheep, and Cain was a tiller of ground.

3And it came to pass at the end of days that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering to JEHOVAH. 4And Abel brought, he also, of the firstlings of his flock and of their fat. And JEHOVAH had respect unto Abel and unto his offering; 5and unto Cain and unto his offering He had not respect: and it was greatly kindled to Cain, and his face fell. 6And JEHOVAH said unto Cain, 'Why has it been kindled to thee, and why has thy face fallen? 7Is there not, if thou do well, (lifting up) acceptance? and if thou doest not well, sin is crouching at the entrance, and unto thee is its* desire; but thou shalt rule over it.'*

8And Cain said concerning [*i.e.* 'meant' mischief to,†] Abel his brother; and it came to pass, in their being in the field, that Cain rose (unto) against Abel his brother, and slew him.

9And JEHOVAH said unto Cain, 'Where is Abel thy brother?' And he said, 'I know not; am I keeping my brother?' 10And He said, 'What hast thou done? The voice of thy brother's blood *is* crying unto me out of the ground. 11And now, cursed art thou above the ground, which opened her mouth to take thy brother's blood from thy hand. 12When thou tillest the ground, it shall not add to give her strength to thee: a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth.' 13And Cain said unto JEHOVAH, 'My iniquity is too great to forgive, (or 'My punishment is too great to bear.') 14Behold! Thou hast driven me away this day from *being* upon the face of the ground, and from Thy face shall I hide myself, and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth, and it will be that any one finding me will slay me.' 15And JEHOVAH said to him, 'Therefore, *as to* any one slaying Cain, he (Cain) shall be avenged sevenfold:' and JEHOVAH set on (or 'to') Cain a mark, that any one finding him might not smite him.

16And Cain went out from the presence of JEHOVAH, and dwelt in the land of Nod, eastward of Eden. 17And Cain knew his wife, and she conceived, and bare Enoch; and he was building a city, and he called the name of the city after the name of his son, Enoch. 18And there was born to Enoch Irad, and Irad begat Mehujael, and Mehujael begat Methusael, and Methusael begat Lamech.

19And Lamech took to him two wives, the name of the one Adah, and the name of the second Zillah. 20And Adah bare Jabal: he was the father of dwellers in tents and among cattle. 21And the name of his brother was Jubal: he was the father of all handling lyre and flute. 22And Zillah—she also bare Tubal-Cain, a forger of all instruments of brass and iron; and the sister of Tubal-Cain *was* Naamah.

---

* So DELITZSCH, *p.*201, and many other commentators. The E. V. has 'his,' 'him,' the Hebrew pronouns being *masculine*, whereas the Hebrew word here used for sin is *feminine*. But, as DELITZSCH observes, sin seems here to be personified, as a wild beast or snake.

† See BOEHMER, *p.*129, and *comp.* Ps.iv.6,x.6,11,13,xiv.1,&c., and especially E.ii.14.

[23]And Lamech said to his wives:

'Adah and Zillah, hear my voice!
Ye wives of Lamech, give ear to my speech!
For I have slain a man for my wound,
And a youth for my hurt.
[24]For Cain shall be avenged sevenfold,
And Lamech seventy-fold and (that) seven-fold = seventy-times seven.

[25]And Adam knew again his wife, and she bare a son, and she called his name (*Sheth*) Seth; 'for ELOHIM,' *said she*, 'hath appointed (*shath*) to me other seed in place of Abel, for Cain slew him.'

[26]And to Seth,—*to* him also, there was born a son, and he called his name Enos. Then was it begun to call upon the name of JEHOVAH.

E(**5**.1–28.) [29]And he called his name (*Noakh*) Noah, saying, 'This shall comfort (*nikham*) us over our work and over the pain of our hands, over the ground which JEHOVAH cursed.' E(*v*.30–32).

**6.** [1]And it came-to-pass that man began to multiply upon the face of the ground, and daughters were born to them. [2]And the sons of ELOHIM saw the daughters of man that they *were* goodly: and they took to them wives of all whom they chose. [3]And JEHOVAH said, 'My spirit shall not preside in man for ever, forasmuch as he also is flesh, and his days shall be a hundred and twenty years.'

[5]And JEHOVAH saw that the wickedness of man was multiplied in the earth, and every (formation) imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil all the days. [6]And JEHOVAH repented that He had made man in the earth, and He was pained in His heart. [7]And JEHOVAH said, 'I will wipe-out man, whom I have created, from off the face of the ground, from man unto cattle, unto creeping-thing, and unto fowl of the heaven; for I repent that I have made them.' [8]But Noah found favour in the eyes of JEHOVAH.

E(*v*.9–14). [15]And this is how thou shalt make it,—three hundred cubits the length of the ark, fifty cubits its breadth, and thirty cubits its height. [16]A light shalt thou make to the Ark, and unto a cubit shalt thou finish it upward, and a door of the Ark shalt thou place in its side; lower, second, and third *stories* shalt thou make it. E(*v*.17–22).

**7.** [1]And JEHOVAH said to Noah, 'Go thou and all thy house into the Ark; for thee do I see righteous before my face in this generation. [2]Out of all the clean cattle thou shall take to thee seven *and* seven, the male and his mate, (*lit.* man and his woman); and out of the cattle, which *are* not clean, it *shall be* two, the male and his mate. [3]Also out of the fowl of the heaven seven *and* seven, male and female, to keep-alive seed upon the face of all the earth. [4]For after yet seven days, I will cause-it-to-rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights; and I will wipe-out all the substance which I have made from off the face of the ground.'

[5]And Noah did according to all which JEHOVAH commanded him.

E(*v*.6–9). [10]And it came-to-pass after the seven days that the waters of the

Deluge were upon the earth. E(*v.*11). [12]And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights.

E(*v.*13–16[a]). [16b]And JEHOVAH shut after him.

[17]And the flood was forty days upon the earth; and the waters multiplied, and they raised the Ark, and it was lifted from off the earth. E(*v.*18[a]); [18b] and the Ark went upon the face of the waters. [19a]And the waters were very, very, mighty upon the earth; E(*v.*19[b]). [20]Fifteen cubits upward the waters were mighty, and the mountains were covered. E(*v.*21,22). [23a]And He wiped out all the substance which *was* upon the face of the ground, from man unto cattle, unto creeping-thing, and unto fowl of the heaven; and they were wiped-out from the earth. E(*v.*23[b],24).

E(**8.**1,2[a]); [2b]and the rain was restrained out of the heaven; [3a]and the waters returned from off the earth continually; E(*v.*3[b]). [4]And the Ark rested [E(*v.*4[b])], [4c]on the Mountains of Ararat. E(*v.*5).

[6]And it came-to-pass, at the end of forty days, that Noah opened the window of the Ark, which he had made. [7]And he put forth the raven, and it went-out, going-out and returning, until the drying-up of the waters from off the earth. [8]And he put-forth the dove from him, to see whether the waters were lightened from off the face of the ground. [9]And the dove found not rest for the sole of its foot, and it returned unto him unto the Ark; for waters *were* upon the face of all the earth; and he put forth his hand, and took it, and brought it unto him into the Ark. [10]And he stayed yet seven other days, and he added to put-forth the dove out of the Ark. [11]And the dove came unto him at the time of evening, and behold an olive-leaf torn-off in its mouth! and Noah knew that the waters were lightened from off the earth. [12]And he stayed yet seven other days, and he put-forth the dove; and it added not to return unto him again. E(*v.*13[a]). [13b]And Noah removed the covering of the Ark, and saw, and behold! the face of the ground was dry.

E (*v.*14–19). [20] and Noah built an altar to JEHOVAH, and took out of all the clean cattle and out of all the clean fowl, and offered burnt-offerings on the altar. [21]And JEHOVAH smelt of the sweet savour, and JEHOVAH said unto His heart, 'I will not add to curse again the ground for the sake of man; for the (formation) imagination of the heart of man is evil from his youth; and I will not add again to smite (all living=) every living-thing, as I have done. [22]Still all the days of the earth, seed-time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night, shall not cease.'

E(**9.**1–17). [1] And the sons of Noah, those going out of the Ark, were Shem, Ham, and Japheth; and Ham—he *is* the father of Canaan. [19] These *were* the three sons of Noah, and out of these was spread-abroad all the earth.

[20]And Noah began *to be* a man of the ground, and he planted a vineyard. [21]And he drank of the wine, and was drunken, and he exposed-himself in the midst of his tent. [22]And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw his father's nakedness, and told *it* to his two brethren without. [23]And Shem and Japheth took the garment, and laid *it* upon the shoulder of both of them, and they went backwards, and covered their father's nakedness; and their faces were backwards, and their father's nakedness they saw not.

[24] And Noah awoke from his wine, and he knew what his younger son had done to him. [25]And he said:

'Cursed *be* Canaan!
A servant of servants shall he be to his brethren.'

[26]And he said:

'Blessed *be* JEHOVAH, the ELOHIM of Shem!
And Canaan shall be a servant to them.
[27]ELOHIM shall enlarge (*yapht*) Japheth (*Yepheth*);
And He shall dwell in the tents of Shem;
[a]And Canaan shall be a servant to them.' E(*v.*28,29).

**11.** [1]And all the earth was of one (lip) language, and of one speech. [2]And it came to pass, in their journeying eastward, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar, and dwelt there. [3]And they said, (man) each to his comrade, 'Here! let us make bricks, and let us burn them (for a burning) thoroughly.' And the bricks were to them for stone, and the slime was to them for the mortar. [4]And they said, 'Here! let us build to us a city, and a tower (and) with its head in the heaven; and let us make to us a name, lest we be spread abroad upon the face of all the earth.'

[5]And JEHOVAH came down to see the city and the tower, which the sons of man had built. [6]And JEHOVAH said, 'Behold! the people is one, and *there is* one (lip) language to all of them; and this is their beginning to do; and now there will not be restrained from them all which they have purposed to do. [7]Come, let us go down, and let us confound there their (lip) language, that they may not know (man) each the (lip) language of his comrade.' [8]And JEHOVAH spread-abroad them from thence upon the face of all the earth, and they left-off to build the city. [9]Therefore (he called, *i.e.* one called =) men called its name Babel; for there JEHOVAH confounded (*balal*) the (lip) language of all the earth; and from thence JEHOVAH spread-abroad them upon the face of all the earth.

E(*v.*10–27,31–32).

**12.** [1]And Jehovah said unto Abram, 'Get thee out of thy land, and out of thy kindred, and out of thy father's house, unto the land which I will (make thee to see) show thee. [2]And I will make thee for a great nation; and I will bless thee, and will magnify thy name; and (be thou) thou shalt be a blessing. [3]And I will bless those blessing thee, and him cursing thee will I curse, and by thee shall be blessed all families of the ground.' [4a]And Abram went as Jehovah spoke unto him, and Lot went with him. E(*v.*4[b],5).

[6]And Abram passed through in the land as far as the place of Shechem, as far as the terebinth of Moreh: and the Canaanite was then in the land. [7]And Jehovah appeared unto Abram, and said, 'To thy seed will I give this land': and he built there an altar to Jehovah who appeared unto him. [8]And he removed thence to the mountain eastward of Bethel, and pitched his tent, Bethel being seaward and Ai eastward: and he built there an altar to Jehovah, and called on the name of Jehovah.

**13.** [7]And there was a strife between the herdsmen of Abram's cattle, and (be-

tween) the herdsmen of Lot's cattle; and the Canaanite and Perizzite *were* dwelling then in the land. [8]And Abram said unto Lot, 'Let there not, I pray, be a striving between me and thee, and between my herdsmen and thy herdsmen; for we are brother-men. [9]Is not all the land before thy face? Be separated, I pray, from me, —if to the left, then I will to the right, and if to the right, then I will to the left.' [10]And Lot lifted up his eyes, and saw the whole circuit of the Jordan, that all of it *was* well-watered, before Jehovah's (corrupting) destroying Sodom and Gomorrah, as the garden of Jehovah, as the land of Egypt, *at* thy entering into Zoar. [11]And Lot chose to himself the whole circuit of the Jordan, and Lot journeyed eastward, and they were separated (a man from his brother) one from another. E(*v.*12[a]); [12b]and he moved-tent as far as Sodom. [13]And the men of Sodom were very evil and sinful before Jehovah.

[14]And Jehovah said unto Abram, after Lot's being separated from him, 'Lift up, I pray, thine eyes, and see, from the place where thou *art*, northward and southward, and eastward, and seaward. [15]For all the land which thou (*art* seeing) seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever. [16]And I make thy seed as the dust of the earth, that, if a man shall be able to count the dust of the earth, also thy seed shall be counted. [17]Arise, walk about in the land, in its length and in its breadth; for to thee will I give it.' [18]And Abram moved-tent, and came, and dwelt at the terebinths of Mamre which *are* in Hebron; and he built there an altar to Jehovah.

**14.*** [1]*And it came to pass in the days of Amraphel, king of Shinar, Arioch, king of Ellasar, Chĕdorlaomer, king of Elam, and Tidal, king of nations,*[2] *that they made war with Bera, king of Sodom, and with Birsha, king of Gomorrah, Shinab, king of Admah, and Shemeber, king of Zeboim, and the king of Bela.* [3]*All these confederated into the Vale of Siddim.* [4]*Twelve years they served Chĕdorlaomer, and the thirteenth year they rebelled.* [5]*And in the fourteenth year came Chĕdorlaomer, and the kings which were with him, and smote the Rephaim in Ashteroth-Karnaim, and the Zuzim in Ham, and the Emim in Shaveh-Kirjathaim,* [6]*and the Horite in their mountain Seir, as far as El-Paran, which is by the desert.* [7]*And they returned, and came to En-Mishpat, and smote all the plain of the Amalekite, and also the Amorite, the dweller in Hazăzon-Tamar.*

[8]*And there went out the king of Sodom, and the king of Gomorrah, and the king of Admah, and the king of Zeboim, and the king of Bela; and they (set out to war) joined battle with them in the Vale of Siddim,—*[9]*with Chĕdorlaomer, king of Elam, and Tidal, king of nations, and Amraphel, king of Shinar, and Arioch, king of Ellasar,—four kings with the five.* [10]*And the Vale of Siddim was (pits, pits,) full of pits of asphalte; and they fled, the king of Sodom, and of Gomorrah, and fell there; and those remaining fled to the mountain.* [11]*And they took all the property of Sodom, and of Gomorrah, and all their food, and went.* [12]*And they took Lot, and his property,—the son of Abram's brother,—and went; (and) for he was dwelling in Sodom.*

---

* By the Second Jehovist ($J_2$), inserted here by J.

*[13]And the fugitive came, and told to Abram the Hebrew, and he was abiding at the terebinths of Mamre the Amorite, the brother of Eshcol, and the brother of Aner: and they (were lords of) had made a covenant with Abram.* [14]*And Abram heard that his brother was captured; and he poured out his trained men, children of his house, three hundred and eighteen, and pursued as far as Dan.* [15]*And he (was divided) divided himself against them by night, he and his servants, and smote them, and pursued them as far as Hobah, which is on the left of Damascus.* [16]*And he brought back all the property, and also Lot his brother, and his property he brought back, and also the women, and the people.*

[17]*And the king of Sodom went out to meet him, after his returning from smiting Chedorlaomer, and the kings which were with him, unto the Vale of Shaveh.* [18]*And Melchizedek, king of Salem, brought out bread and wine, and he was priest of El Most-High.* [19]*And he blessed him, and said,*

*'Blessed is Abram of El Most-High,*
*Possessor of Heaven and Earth!*
[20]*And blessed is El Most-High,*
*Who has delivered thy foes into thy hand!'*

*And he gave to him a tithe out of all.*

[21]*And the king of Sodom said unto Abram, 'Give to me the souls, and the property take to thyself.'* [22]*And Abram said unto the king of Sodom, 'I have lifted up my hand unto Jehovah, El Most-High, Possessor of Heaven and Earth,* [23]*that not from a thread even to a shoe-latchet, nor out of all which is thine, will I take, that so thou say not, I have enriched Abram:* [24]*except only what the young men have eaten, and the portion of the men who went with me, Aner, Eshcol, and Mamre,—let them take their portion.'*

E(**16.**1,3,15,16,**17.**1–27).

**18.** [1]And Jehovah appeared to him at the terebinths of Mamre, and he *was* sitting at the opening of the tent in the heat of the day. [2]And he lifted up his eyes and saw, and behold three men standing by him! and he saw, and ran to meet them from the opening of the tent, and bowed himself to the earth. [3]And he said, 'My lords, if, I pray, I have found favour in thine eyes, do not, I pray, pass from thy servant. [4]Let there be taken, I pray, a little water, and wash your feet, and rest yourselves beneath the tree. [5]And I will take a crumb of bread, and sustain ye your heart; afterwards ye shall pass; for therefore have ye passed beside thy servant.' And they said 'So do as thou hast spoken.'

[6]And Abraham hastened to the tent unto Sarah, and said, 'Hasten three seahs of fine meal; knead it, and make hearth-cakes.' [7]And to the herds ran Abraham, and took a calf tender and good, and gave it to the young-man, and he hastened to (make) prepare it. [8]And he took curds and milk, and the calf which he had (made) prepared, and (gave) set it before them, and he *was* standing by them beneath the tree; and they ate.

[9]And they said unto him, 'Where *is* Sarah thy wife?' And he said, 'Behold! in the tent.' [10]And he said, 'I will surely return unto thee according to the time of life, and behold! a son *shall be* to Sarah thy wife.' And Sarah *was* hearkening,

at the opening of the tent, and she *was* behind him. 11And Abraham and Sarah were old, (gone) advanced in days: it ceased to be to Sarah *in* a way according to women. 12And Sarah laughed within her, saying, 'After my being worn-out there (has) will have been to me pleasure, and my lord *being* old!' 13And Jehovah said unto Abraham, 'Wherefore *is* this *that* Sarah laughed, saying, Shall I indeed really bear, and I have become old?' 14Is (a) any matter too wonderful for Jehovah? At the season I will return unto thee according to the time of life, and *there shall be* a son to Sarah.' 15And Sarah lied, saying, 'I laughed not,' for she feared: and He said, 'No! for thou didst laugh.'

16And the men rose up from thence, and looked towards Sodom, and Abraham *was* going with them to put them (forth) forward. 17And Jehovah said, 'Shall I hide from Abraham what I am doing?' 20And Jehovah said, 'The cry of Sodom and Gomorrah! for it is great; and their sin! for it is very heavy. 21Let me go down, I pray, and see whether according to their cry, that has come unto me, they have done completely, and, if not, I will know. 22And the men faced from thence, and went Sodom-wards: and Abraham *was* still standing before Jehovah.

23And Abraham came near, and said, '*Is it* so that thou wilt destroy righteous with wicked? 24Perhaps, there are fifty righteous in the midst of the city: *is it* so that thou wilt destroy, and not forgive the place, on account of the fifty righteous who *are* in the midst of it? 25Far be it to thee from doing according to this word, to put-to-death righteous with wicked, and it shall be, so the righteous as the wicked! Far be it to thee! He that judgeth all the earth, shall not He do justice?' 26And Jehovah said, 'If I shall find in Sodom fifty righteous in the midst of the city, then I will forgive all the place for their sake.' 27And Abraham answered and said, 'Behold, I pray! I have resolved to speak unto my Lord, and I *being* dust and ashes! 28Perhaps, the fifty righteous shall lack five: wilt Thou (corrupt) destroy for the five the whole city?' And He said, 'I will not (corrupt) destroy, if I find there forty and five.' 29And he added again to speak unto him, and said, 'Perhaps, there shall be found there forty?' And He said, 'I will not do *it*, for the sake of the forty.' 30And he said, 'Let it not, I pray, be kindled to my Lord, and I will speak. Perhaps, there shall be found there thirty?' And He said, 'I will not do *it*, if I find there thirty.' 31And he said, 'Behold, I pray! I have resolved to speak unto my Lord. 'Perhaps, there shall be found there twenty?' And He said, 'I will not (corrupt) destroy, for the sake of the twenty.' 32And he said, 'Let it not, I pray, be kindled to my Lord, and I will speak only this time. Perhaps, there shall be found there ten?' And He said, 'I will not (corrupt) destroy for the sake of the ten.'

33And Jehovah went, (as) when He had finished to speak unto Abraham; and Abraham returned to his place.

**19.** 1And the two angels came to Sodom in the evening, and Lot *was* sitting in the gate of Sodom: and Lot saw, and rose up to meet them, and bowed himself, his (nostrils) face to the earth. 2And he said, 'Behold, I pray! my lords, turn-in, I pray, unto the house of your servant, and pass-the-night, and wash your feet, and you shall rise early and go on your way.' And they said, 'No! for in the

street will we pass-the-night.' [3]And he pressed upon them (very) much, and they turned-in unto him, and went-in into his house, and he made for them a feast, and baked unleavened-cakes, and they ate. [4]They had not yet lain down, and the men of the city, the men of Sodom, surrounded about the house, from young-man and unto old-man, all the people promiscuously. [5]And they called unto Lot, and said to him, 'Where *are* the men, who came unto thee to-night? Bring them out unto us, and we will know them.' [6]And Lot went-out unto them to the (opening) entrance, and the door he shut behind him. [7]And he said, 'Do not, I pray, my brethren, do evil. [8]Behold, I pray! (*there are* to me) I have two daughters, who have not known man: let me bring-out them, I pray, unto you, and do to them as *is* good in your eyes: only to these men do not (a) any thing; for therefore have they come (in) under the shadow of my roof-tree.' [9]And they said, 'Get away!' and they said, 'This one came to sojourn, and he will surely judge: now will we do evil to thee more than them;' and they pressed (very) much upon the man, upon Lot, and they came near to break the door. [10]And the men put-forth their hand and brought-in Lot unto them into the house, and they shut the door, [11]And the men, who *were* at the opening of the house, they smote with blindness, from small and unto great, and they tried-in-vain to find the door.

[12]And the men said unto Lot, 'Who is there still to thee here? son-in-law, and thy sons, and thy daughters, and all which (*is* to thee) thou hast in the city, bring *them* out from this place. [13]For we (*are* destroying) will destroy this place; for their cry has become great before JEHOVAH, and JEHOVAH has sent us to destroy it.' [14]And Lot went-out and spoke to his sons-in-law, (the takers of) who had married his daughters, and said, 'Rise-up, go-out from this place; for Jehovah (*is* destroying) will destroy the city: and he *was* as though making-laughter in the eyes of his sons-in-law.

[15]And as the dawn arose, then the angels hastened Lot, saying, 'Rise-up, take thy wife and thy two daughters which are (found) at hand, lest thou be destroyed in the iniquity of the city.' [16]And he loitered, and the men laid-hold upon his hand, and upon the hand of his wife, and upon the hand of his two daughters, (in) through the compassion of Jehovah upon him; and they brought him out, and (left him) set him down without the city. [17]And it-came-to-pass, when they had brought them out without, that he said, 'Escape for thy soul! Look not behind thee, and stop not in all the circuit! Escape to the mountain, lest thou be destroyed!' [18]And Lot said unto them, 'Not so, I pray, my lords! [19]Behold, I pray! thy servant hath found favour in thine eyes, and thou hast magnified thy mercy which thou hast done with me to keep-alive my soul: and I am not able to escape to the mountain, lest the evil cleave to me, and I die. [20]Behold, I pray! this city is near to flee thither; and it is a little-one: let me escape, I pray, thither,—is it not a little-one? and my soul shall live.' [21]And he said unto him, 'Behold, I have (lifted-up) accepted thy face also for this matter, so that I will not overthrow the city of which thou hast spoken. [22]Haste! escape thither! for I am not able to do (a) any thing, until thy coming thither.' Therefore (he) one called the name of the city, Zoar.

[23]The sun went out over the earth, and Lot entered into Zoar. [24]And Jehovah

caused-it-to rain upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah sulphur and fire, from Jehovah out of the heaven. [25]And He overthrew those cities, and all the circuit, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and the (sprout) produce of the ground. [26]And his wife looked from behind her, and she became a pillar of salt. [27]And Abraham rose-early in the morning, unto the place where he stood before Jehovah. [28]And he looked towards Sodom and Gomorrah, and towards all the land of the circuit; and he saw and behold! the smoke of the land went up as the smoke of the furnace. E(*v.*29).

[30]And Lot went-up out of Zoar, and dwelt in the mountain, and his two daughters with him, for he feared to dwell in Zoar; and he dwelt in the cave, he and his two daughters. [31]And the elder said unto the younger, 'Our father is old, and there is not a man in the earth to come in upon us, according to the way of all the earth. [32]Come, let us make our father drink wine, and lie with him, and keep-alive seed out of our father.' [33]But they made their father drink wine on that night; and the elder went-in, and lay with her father, and he knew not at her lying and at her rising. [34]And it-came-to-pass on the morrow, (and) that the elder said unto the younger, 'Behold! I lay yesternight with my father: let us make him drink wine also this night, and go-thou-in, lie with him; and we shall keep-alive seed out of our father.' [35]And they made their father on that night also drink wine; and the younger rose-up, and lay with him; and he knew not at her lying and at her rising. [36]And the two daughters of Lot conceived by their father. [37]And the elder bare a son, and she called his name Moab: he *was* the father of Moab unto this day. [38]And the younger she also bare a son, and she called his name Ben-Ammi: he *was* the father of the children of Ammon unto this day.

**20.** $J^1$(**20.**1–17). [18]For Jehovah had closely restrained every womb of the house of Abimelech, for the matter of Sarah, Abraham's wife.

**21.** [1]And Jehovah visited Sarah as He had said, and Jehovah did to Sarah as He had spoken. E(*v.*2–5), $J^1J^2$(*v.*6–34).

$J^2$(**22.**1–13,19), E(**23.**1–20,**25.**7–11[a],12–17).

E(*v.*19,20). [21a]And Isaac entreated Jehovah (over-against) with respect to his wife, for she *was* barren; and Jehovah was entreated to him; E(*v.*21[b]). [22]And the children struggled-violently (in the middle of her) within her, and she said, 'If so, wherefore *am* I this?' and she went to enquire of Jehovah. [23]And Jehovah said to her:

> 'Two nations *are* in thy womb,
> And two folks shall be separated from thy bowels;
> And folk shall be stronger than folk,
> And the elder shall serve the younger.' E(*v.*24–26).

$EJ^1J^2$(**26.**18,34,35, **28.**1–**29.**30). E(**29.**32[ab],&c., **30.**1[a],4[a],&c.21–24[a]).

$EJ^2$(**31.**2,4–48[a],50–55, **32.**1,2,13[a],22[ac],24[b]–32, **33.**18–**34.**31, **35.**5,6,16*–29, **36.**1–19,31–35,36–43, **37.**1–36).

**38.** [1]And it came-to-pass at that time, that Judah went down from his brethren,

---

* We suppose that *v.*9–15 was meant to have been cancelled, for the reasons stated in (294).

and (stretched) turned-aside to a certain Adullamite, and his name *was* Hirah. [2]And Judah saw there a daughter of a certain Canaanite, and her name *was* Shuah, and he took her, and went-in unto her. [3]And she conceived, and bare a son, and he called his name Er. [4]And she conceived again, and bare a son, and she called his name Onan. [5]And she added still, and conceived a son, and she called his name Shelah; and he was at Chezib at her bearing him.

[6]And Judah took a wife to Er his firstborn, and her name *was* Tamar. [7]And Er, Judah's firstborn, was evil in the eyes of Jehovah, and Jehovah killed him. [8]And Judah said to Onan, 'Go-in unto thy brother's wife, and marry her, and raise up seed to thy brother.' [9]And Onan knew that the seed would not be his; and it came-to-pass, when he went unto his brother's wife, (and) that he wasted *it* to the ground, so as not to give seed to his brother. [10]And it was evil in the eyes of Jehovah what he did, and He killed him also.

[11]And Judah said to Tamar his daughter-in-law, 'Dwell a widow in thy father's house, until Shelah my son shall be (great) grown': for he said, 'lest he too die as his brethren.' And Tamar went and dwelt at her father's house.

[12]And the days were multiplied, and Shuah's daughter, Judah's wife, died: and Judah was comforted, and went-up (upon) unto the shearers of the flocks, he and his friend Hirah the Adullamite, to Timnah. [13]And it was told to Tamar, saying, 'Behold! thy father-in-law goeth up to Timnah, to shear his sheep.' [14]And she put-off the garments of her widowhood from off her, and covered *herself* with the vail, and wrapped herself, and sat at the opening of Enaim, which is upon the way to Timnah: for she saw that Shelah was (great) grown, and she was not given to him for wife. [15]And Judah saw her, and imagined her for a harlot, for she had covered her face. [16]And he turned-aside unto her into the way, and said, 'Go to, I pray: let me come-in unto thee': for he knew not that she was his daughter-in-law. And she said, 'What wilt thou give to me, that thou mayest come-in unto me?' [17]And he said, 'I will send a kid out of the flocks.' And she said, 'Wilt thou give me a pledge, until thy sending it?' [18]And he said, 'What *is* the pledge which I shall give thee?' and she said, 'Thy signet, and thy bracelets, and thy staff which *is* in thy hand.' And he gave *them* to her, and went unto her, and she conceived to him. [19]And she arose, and went, and took-off her vail from off her, and she put-on the garments of her widowhood. [20]And Judah sent the kid of the goats by the hand of his friend the Adullamite, to take the pledge out of the hand of the woman; and he found her not. [21]And he asked of the men of the place, saying, 'Where is the devotee?* She was at Enaim upon the way': and they said, 'There was not in this *place* a devotee.' [22]And he returned unto Judah and said, 'I have not found her; and also the men of the place said, There has not been a devotee in this *place*.' [23]And Judah said, 'Thou shalt take *it* for her, lest we become a contempt. Behold! I sent this kid, and thou didst not find her.'

[24]And it-came-to-pass, after about three months, that it was told to Judah,

---

* Heb. *Kĕdeshah*, 'holy woman,' that is, one who prostituted herself in honour of some deity: see (345).

saying, 'Tamar, thy daughter-in-law, has played-the-harlot, and also behold! she is with-child to harlotry.' And Judah said, 'Bring her out, and let her be burnt.' [25]She was brought-out, and she was sent unto her father-in-law, saying, 'To the man, whose these things are, I *am* with-child'; and she said, 'Recognise, I pray, whose are the signet and the bracelets and the staff, these.' [26]And Judah recognised, and said, 'She has been righteous above me, for therefore *she did it*, (because) I gave her not to Shelah my son': and he added not still to know her.

[27]And it came-to-pass at the time of her bearing, that behold! twins *were* in her womb. [28]And it came-to-pass at her bearing, that (he) one put-forth his hand; and the midwife took, and bound upon his hand scarlet, saying, 'This came-forth first.' [29]And it came-to-pass, as he took-back his hand, that behold! his brother came forth, and she said, 'For what hast thou broken-forth (*paraz*)? Upon thee *be* the breach (*perez*)!' and she called his name Perez. [30]And afterwards came-out his brother upon whose hand was the scarlet, and (he) one called his name Zarah.

**39.** [1]And Joseph was brought down to Egypt, and Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh, chief of the guard, an Egyptian, bought him out of the hand of the Ishmaelites, who brought him down thither. [2]And Jehovah was with Joseph, and he was a man making-to-prosper, and he was in the house of his master the Egyptian. [3]And his master saw that Jehovah was with him, and all which he *was* doing Jehovah *was* making-to-prosper in his hand. [4]And Joseph found favour in his eyes, and he ministered to him, and he appointed him over his house, and all he had he (gave) put in his hand. [5]And it came-to-pass from then, *when* Pharaoh had appointed him in his house, and over all which he had, that Jehovah blessed the house of the Egyptian on account of Joseph; and the blessing of Jehovah was on all which he had in the house and in the field. [6]And he left all which he had in Joseph's hand, and knew not with him anything except the bread which he *was* eating; and Joseph was fair of form and fair of appearance. [7]And it came-to-pass after these things that his master's wife lifted-up her eyes unto Joseph, and she said, 'Lie with me.' [8]And he refused, and said unto his master's wife, 'Behold! my lord knoweth not with me what is in the house, and all which he has he has (given) put in my hand. [9]There is none great in the house above me, and he has not kept-back from me anything except thee, for that thou *art* his wife: how shall I do this great evil, and sin against Elohim?' [10]And it came-to-pass, as she spake unto Joseph day *after* day, that he hearkened not unto her to lie near her, to be with her. [11]And it came-to-pass about this time that he went to the house to do his business, and there was no man from the men of the house there in the house. [12]And she caught him by his garment, saying, 'Lie with me,' and he left his garment in her hand, and fled, and went-out-without. [13]And it came-to-pass, as she saw that he had left his garment in her hand, and fled without, [14]that she cried unto the men of her house, and said to them, saying, 'See! he has brought to us a Hebrew to laugh at us! He came unto me to lie with me, and I cried with a loud voice; [15]and it came-to-pass, as he heard that I lifted-up my voice and cried, that he left his garment near me, and fled, and went-out without.' [16]And she laid-up his garment near her, until her lord's coming unto his house. [17]And she spake unto

him according to these words, saying, 'There came unto me the servant, the Hebrew whom thou broughtest to us to laugh at me. [18]And it came-to-pass, as I lifted up my voice and cried, (and) that he left his garment near me, and fled without.' [19]And it came-to-pass, as his master heard the words of his wife which she spake unto him, saying, 'According to these words thy servant did to me,' that his anger was kindled. [20]And Joseph's master took him, and (gave) put him into the house of the tower, the place where the king's prisoners were bound, and he was there in the house of the tower. [21]And Jehovah was with Joseph, and extended unto him mercy, and (gave) put his favour in the eyes of the chief of the house of the tower. [22]And the chief of the house of the tower (gave) put in Joseph's hand all the prisoners which *were* in the house of the tower; and all, which they *were* doing there, he was doing. [23]The chief of the house of the tower (was not seeing) saw not anything in his hand, for that Jehovah was with him, and, what he was doing, Jehovah *was* making-to-prosper.

**40.** [1]And it came-to-pass after these things the butler of the king of Egypt and the baker sinned against their lord, against the king of Egypt. $J^1$(*v.*2,3[a]),[3b] into the house of the tower, the place where Joseph was bound. $J^1$(*v.*4,5[a]),[5b] who were bound in the house of the tower. $J^1$(*v.*6–23).

$J^1J^2$(**41.**1–**45.**28).

$EJ^2$(**46.**1–12[a]); [12b](and) but Er died, and Onan, in the land of Canaan, and the sons of Pharez were Hezron and Hamul. $EJ^2$(*v.*13–34).

$EJ^2$(**47.**1–**50.**26).

---

## THE FOURTH SET OF JEHOVISTIC INSERTIONS ($J^4$),

### *in the beginning of Solomon's reign.*

$EJ^3$(**1.**1–**9.**29).

**10.** [1]And these *are* the generations of the sons of Noah,—Shem, Ham, and Japheth; and there were born to them sons after the Deluge.

[2]The sons of Japheth, Gomer, and Magog, and Madai, and Javan, and Tubal, and Meshech, and Tiras.

[3]And the sons of Gomer, Ashkenaz and Riphath, and Togarmah.

[4]And the sons of Javan, Elisha and Tarshish, Kittim and Dodanim.

[5]Out of these were separated the isles of the nations in their lands, (man) each after his tongue, after their families, in their nations.

[6]And the sons of Ham, Cush, and Mizraim, and Phut, and Canaan.

[7]And the sons of Cush, Seba, and Havilah, and Sabtah, and Raamah, and Sabtechah; and the sons of Raamah, Sheba, and Dedan.

[13]And Mizraim begat Ludim, Anamim, and Lehavim, and Naphtuchim, [14]and Pathrusim, and Casluchim,—out of whom went-forth Philistim,—and Caphtorim,

15And Canaan begat Zidon his firstborn and Heth, 16and the Jebusite, and the Amorite, and the Girgashite, 17and the Hivite, and the Arkite, and the Sinite, 18and the Arvadite, and the Zemarite, and the Hemathite: and afterwards the families of the Canaanite were spread-abroad. 19And the border of the Canaanite was from Zidon, *in* thy going to Gerar, unto Gaza,—*in* thy going to Sodom, and Gomorrah, and Admah, and Zeboim, unto Lasha.

20These are the sons of Ham after their families, after their tongues, in their lands, in their nations.

21And to Shem, to him also there was born (offspring),—the father of all the sons of *Heber*, the elder brother of Japheth.

22The sons of Shem, Elam, and Asshur, and Arphaxad, and Lud, and Aram.

23And the sons of Aram, Uz, and Hul, and Gether, and Mash.

24And Arphaxad begat Salah, and Salah begat (*Heber*) Eber. 25And to Eber were born two sons,—the name of one Peleg, for in his days the earth was divided (*palag*), and the name of his brother, Joktan. 26And Joktan begat Almodad, and Sheleph, and Hazarmaveth, and Jerah, 27and Hadoram, and Uzal, and Diklah, 28and Obal, and Abimael, and Sheba, 29and Ophir, and Havilah, and Jobab: all these *were* the sons of Joktan. 30And their dwelling was from Mesha, *in* thy going to Sephar, the mountain of the East.

31These *are* the sons of Shem, after their families, after their tongues, in their lands, after their nations.

32These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations; and out of these were separated the nations in the earth after the Deluge.

EJ[3] (**11.**1–27). 28And Haran died eastward of Terah his father, in the land of his kindred, in Ur of the Chaldees. 29And Abram and Nahor took to them wives; the name of Abram's wife Sarai, and the name of Nahor's wife Milcah, the daughter of Haran, the father of Milcah and the father of Iscah. 30And Sarai was barren: (there was to her) she had no child. E(*v.*31,32).

EJ[3](**12.**1–8). 9And Abram (broke-up) journeyed, journeying continually to the (Negeb) south-country. 10And there was a famine in the land; and Abram went down to Egypt to sojourn there; for the famine was heavy in the land. 11And it came to pass, as he approached to enter into Egypt that he said unto Sarai his wife, 'Behold, I pray! I know that a woman fair of form art thou. 12And it shall come to pass, when the Egyptians shall see thee, that they will say, 'This *is* his wife'; and they will slay me, and thee they will keep-alive, 13Say, I pray, thou *art* my sister, that so it may be well to me for thy sake, and my soul shall live on account of thee.' 14And it came to pass, as Abram entered into Egypt, that the Egyptians saw the woman that she *was* very fair. 15And the princes of Pharaoh saw her, and they praised her unto Pharaoh, and the woman was taken *into* the house of Pharaoh. 16And he did well to Abram for her sake; and (there was to him) he had flocks and herds, and he-asses, and men-servants, and maid-servants, and she-asses, and camels.

17And Jehovah plagued Pharaoh *with* great plagues, and his house, for the affair of Sarai Abram's wife. 18And Pharaoh called to Abram, and said, 'What is this

thou hast done to me? Wherefore didst thou not tell me that she *was* thy wife? [19]Wherefore didst thou say, 'She *is* my sister,' and I took her to me for wife? And now, behold thy wife! take *her*, and go.' [20]And Pharaoh commanded men concerning him, and they (put forth) dismissed him, and his wife, and all his.

**13.** [1]And Abram went up from Egypt, he, and his wife, and all his, and Lot with him, to the (Negeb) south-country. [2]And Abram was very (heavy) wealthy in cattle, in silver, and in gold. [3]And he went in his journeyings from the (Negeb) south-country, and as far as Bethel, as far as the place where his tent was in the commencement, between Bethel and Ai,—[4]to the place of the altar which he made there in the beginning; and Abram called there on the name of Jehovah. [5]And also to Lot, who went with Abram, there were flocks and herds and tents.

EJ$^3$(**13.**6–18),J$_2$(**14.**1–24).

E(**16.**1). [2]And Sarai said unto Abram, 'Behold, I pray! Jehovah hath bound me from bearing. Go in, I pray, unto my maid: perhaps, I shall be built up out of her.' And Abram hearkened to the voice of Sarai. E(*v.*3). [4]And he went in unto Hagar, and she conceived, and she saw that she had conceived, and her mistress was (light) despised in her eyes. [5]And Sarai said unto Abram, 'My wrong upon thee! I have given my maid into thy bosom, and she saw that she had conceived, and I was (light) despised in her eyes. Jehovah judge between me and thee!' [6]And Abram said unto Sarai, 'Behold! thy maid *is* in thy hand: do to her (the good) what is good in thine eyes.' And Sarai afflicted her, and she fled from her face.

[7]And the angel of Jehovah found her by the spring of water in the desert, by the spring which is in the way (of) to Shur. [8]And he said, 'Hagar, Sarai's maid, whence camest thou, and whither goest thou?' And she said, 'From the face of Sarai, my mistress, I *am* fleeing.' [9]And the angel of Jehovah said to her, 'Return unto thy mistress, and (afflict thyself) be afflicted under her hands.' [10]And the angel of Jehovah said to her, 'I will multiply exceedingly thy seed, and it shall not be numbered for multitude.' [11]And the angel of Jehovah said to her, 'Behold! thou art with-child, and shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name, 'Ishmael'; for Jehovah hath hearkened (*shamah*) unto thy affliction. [12]And he shall be a wild-ass of a man, his hand against every-man, and every-man's hand against him, and eastward of all his brethren shall he abide.'

[13]And she called the name of Jehovah who was speaking unto her, El-Roi, (= 'El of seeing,') for she said, 'Have I also here (seen) survived after my seeing?' [14]Therefore (he) one called the well, the well La-Khai-Roi (=well of the Living-Seeing); behold! it *is* between Kadesh and Bered.

EJ$^1$J$^2$J$^3$(**16.**15,16,**17.**1–27,**18.**1–17,20–33,**19.**1–38,***21.**1–7,***22.**1–15,19).

**22.** [20]And it came-to-pass after these things that it was told to Abraham, saying, 'Behold! Milcah, she also hath borne children to Nahor, thy brother; [21]Uz, his first-born, and Buz, his brother, and Kemuel, the father of Aram, [22]and Chesed, and Hazo, and Pildash, and Jidlaph, and Bethuel.' [23]And Bethuel begat Rebekah.

---

* We suppose that **20.**1–18, and **21.**8–34, were meant by the Jehovist, in his last revision, to be *cancelled* (290).

These eight did Milcah bear to Nahor. [23]And his concubine—and her name *was* Reumah—(and) she also bare Tebah, and Gaham, and Mahash, and Maacah.

E(**23**.1–20).

**24.** [1]And Abraham *was* old, (gone) advanced in days; and Jehovah had blessed Abraham in all things. [2]And Abraham said unto his servant, the old-man of his house, who was ruling over all that he had, 'Place, I pray, thy hand beneath my thigh: [3]and I will make thee swear by Jehovah, the Elohim of Heaven and the Elohim of Earth, that thou wilt not take a wife for my son out of the daughters of the Canaanite, in the middle of whom I *am* dwelling. [4]For unto my land and unto my kindred shalt thou go; and take a wife for my son, for Isaac. [5]And the servant said unto him, 'Perhaps, the woman will not be willing to go after me unto this land. Shall I certainly return unto the land from which thou wentest-forth?' [6]And Abraham said unto him, 'Beware-thee, lest thou return my son thither! [7]Jehovah, the Elohim of heaven, who took me out of my father's house, and out of the land of my kindred, and who spake to me, and who sware to me saying, 'To thy seed I will give this land,' He shall send His angel before thee, and thou shalt take a wife for my son from thence. [8]And, if the woman shall not be willing to go after thee, then thou shalt be innocent from this my swearing: only my son shalt thou not return thither.' [9]And the servant placed his hand beneath the thigh of Abraham his lord, and he sware to him concerning this matter.

[10]And the servant took ten camels out of his lord's camels, and he went, and all his lord's goods *were* in his hand; and he arose, and went unto Aram-Naharaim, unto the city of Nahor. [11]And he made the camels kneel outside the city, (unto) towards the well of water, at the time of evening, at the time of the going-out of the *water*-drawers. [12]And he said, 'Jehovah, Elohim of my lord Abraham! make-to-meet [*i.e.*, what I desire], I pray, before my face this day, and do mercy with my lord Abraham. [13]Behold! I *am* stationed by the spring of water, and the daughters of the men of the city are coming-out to draw water. [14]And it shall be, the maiden to whom I shall say, 'Hold-out, I pray, thy pitcher, and I will drink,' and she shall say, 'Drink, and also I will water thy camels,' her thou hast made-plain for thy servant for Isaac, and by her I shall know that thou hast done mercy with my lord.'

[15]And it came to pass *that* he had not yet finished to speak, and behold Rebekah coming-out,—who was born to Bethuel, the son of Milcah, the wife of Nahor, Abraham's brother,—and her pitcher upon her shoulder! [16]And the maiden *was* very goodly of form, a virgin, and no man had known her; and she went-down to the spring, and filled her pitcher, and came up. [17]And the servant ran to meet her, and said, 'Let me swallow, I pray, a little water out of thy pitcher.' [18]And she said, 'Drink, my lord!' and she hasted, and lowered her pitcher upon her hand, and (watered him) gave him drink. [19]And she finished to give him drink, and said, 'Also for thy camels I will draw, until they have finished to drink.' [20]And she hasted and emptied her pitcher into the trough, and ran again unto the well to draw, and drew for all his camels.

[21]And the man *was* amazed at her, keeping-silence to know whether Jehovah had

prospered his way, or not. 22And it came to pass, as the camels had finished to drink, then the man took a nose-ring of gold, its weight a bekah, and two bracelets for her hands, ten *shekels* of gold their weight. 23And he said, 'The daughter of whom *art* thou? Tell me, I pray, is there in thy father's house a place for us to spend-the-night?' 24And she said unto him, 'The daughter of Bethuel *am* I, the son of Milcah, whom she bare to Nahor.' 25And she said unto him, 'Both (chopped-straw) fodder and forage *is* plenty with us, also a place to spend-the-night.' 26And the man stooped and bowed-down (to) before Jehovah, 27and said,—

'Blessed *be* Jehovah, the Elohim of my lord Abraham,
Who hath not put-away His mercy and His truth from my lord!
I being in the way,
Jehovah hath guided me to the house of my lord's brother.'

28And the maiden ran, and told her mother's house according to these words. 29And Rebekah had a brother, and his name *was* Laban; and Laban ran unto the man without unto the spring. 30And it came to pass, at his seeing the nose-ring and the bracelets upon the hands of his sister, at his hearing the words of Rebekah his sister, saying, Thus the man spake unto me, that he went unto the man, and behold! he *was* standing by the camels by the spring. 31And he said, 'Enter, thou blessed of Jehovah! wherefore standest thou without? And I have prepared the house, and a place for the camels.'

32And the man entered into the house, and he (opened) loosened the camels, and gave fodder and forage to the camels, and water to wash his feet and the feet of the men who *were* with him. 33And he set before him *food* to eat: and he said, 'I will not eat, until I have spoken my words': and he said, 'Speak.' 34And he said, 'Abraham's servant *am* I. 35And Jehovah hath blessed greatly my lord, and he is become great; and he hath given to him flocks and herds, and silver and gold, and servants and maids, and camels and he-asses. 36And Sarah, my lord's wife, bare a son to my lord, after her being old; and he hath given to him all which he hath. 37And my lord made me swear, saying, 'Thou shalt not take a wife for my son out of the daughters of the Canaanite, in whose land I *am* dwelling. 38But unto my father's house shalt thou go and unto my family, and take a wife for my son.' 39And I said unto my lord, 'Perhaps, the woman will not go after me.' 40And he said unto me, 'Jehovah, before whose face I have walked, shall send his angel with thee, and prosper thy way; and thou shalt take a wife for my son, out of my family, and out of my father's house. 41Then shalt thou be-innocent from my oath, (that) when thou shalt come unto my family, and if they will not give to thee, then thou shalt be innocent from my oath.' 42And I came this day unto the spring, and I said, 'Jehovah, Elohim of my lord Abraham! if, I pray, thou *art* prospering my way, upon which I *am* going, 43behold! I stand by the spring of water, and it shall come to pass, the maiden, who comes-forth to draw, and I shall have said unto her, 'Give-me-to-drink, I pray, a little water out of thy pitcher,' 44and she shall say unto me, 'Both drink thou, and also for thy camels I will draw,'—she *is* the woman, whom Jehovah hath-made-plain for my lord's son.' 45I had not yet finished to speak unto my heart, and behold

Rebekah coming-forth, and her pitcher upon her shoulder! And she went down to the spring, and drew: and I said unto her, 'Give-me-to-drink, I pray.' [46]And she hastened and lowered her pitcher from-off her, and said, 'Drink, and also thy camels I will water;' and I drank, and also the camels she watered. [47]And I asked her and said, 'Whose daughter *art* thou?' And she said, 'The daughter of Bethuel, the son of Nahor, whom Milcah bare to him.' And I placed the nose-ring upon her face, and the bracelets upon her hands. [48]And I stooped, and bowed-down (to) before Jehovah, and blessed Jehovah, the Elohim of my lord Abraham, who had guided me in a way of truth, to take the daughter of my lord's brother for his son. [49]And now, if you *are for* doing mercy and truth with my lord, tell (to) me; and if not, tell me; and I will face (upon) towards the right or towards the left.'

[50]And Laban answered, and Bethuel, and they said, 'From Jehovah has come-forth the matter; we cannot speak unto thee evil or good. [51]Behold! Rebekah *is* before thee: take *her*, and go: and let her be wife to thy lord's son, according as Jehovah hath spoken.' [52]And it came-to-pass, as Abraham's servant heard their words, that he bowed-down to the ground (to) before Jehovah. [53]And the servant brought-forth articles of silver, and articles of gold, and garments, and gave to Rebekah; and he gave precious-things to her brother and to her mother. [54]And they ate and drank, he and the men who *were* with him, and spent the-night: and they arose in the morning, and he said, 'Put-me-forth to my lord.' [55]And her brother said, and her mother, 'Let the maiden dwell with us *some* days or ten: afterwards she shall go.' [56]And he said unto them, 'Do not delay me, (and) since Jehovah hath prospered my way: put-me-forth, and I will go to my lord.' [57]And they said, 'We will call to the maiden, and will ask at her mouth.' [58]And they called to Rebekah, and said unto her, 'Wilt thou go with this man?' and she said, 'I will go.' [61]And Rebekah arose, and her maidens, and they rode upon the camels, and went after the man; and the servant took Rebekah and went. [62]And Isaac came from going to the well La-Khai-Roi, and he was dwelling in the land of the Negeb. [63]And Isaac went-out to stroll in the field at the approach of evening; and he lifted-up his eyes, and saw, and behold camels coming! [64]And Rebekah lifted-up her eyes, and saw Isaac, and she dropped from-off the camel. [65]And she said unto the servant, 'Who *is* this man here, who *is* walking in the field to meet us?' and the servant said, 'He is my lord.' And she took the vail, and covered-herself. [66]And the servant recounted to Isaac all the things which he had done. [67]And Isaac brought her into the tent of Sarah his mother, and he took Rebekah, and she became wife to him, and he loved her; and Isaac was comforted after his mother.

**25.** [1]And Abraham added and took a wife, and her name was Keturah. [2]And she bare to him Zimran, and Jokshan, and Medan, and Midian, and Ishbak, and Shuah. [3]And Jokshan begat Sheba and Dedan: and the sons of Dedan were Asshurim, and Letushim, and Leummim. [4]And the sons of Midian, Ephah, and Epher, and Enoch, and Abidah, and Eldaah. All these were sons of Keturah.

[5]And Abraham gave all which he had to Isaac. [6]And to the sons of the

concubines,* which Abraham had, Abraham gave gifts, and put-them-forth away-from Isaac his son, while himself was still living, eastward unto the land of the east.

E(*v.*7–11ª); [11b]and Isaac dwelt by the well La-Khai-Roi.

EJ²(*v.*12–17). [18]And they abode from Havilah as far as Shur, which is eastward of Egypt, at thy going to Asshur; eastward of all his brethen he fell.

EJ²(*v.*19–26). [27]And the lads grew, and Esau was a man knowing hunting, a man of the field, and Jacob a mild man, dwelling in tents. [28]And Isaac loved Esau, for (game was in his mouth) he ate of his game; (and) but Rebekah loved Jacob.

[29]And Jacob sod pottage; and Esau came-in out of the field, and he was faint. [30]And Esau said unto Jacob, 'Let me swallow, I pray, of the red-stuff, that red-stuff; for I am faint': therefore (he) one called his name Edom = 'Red.' [31]And Jacob said, 'Sell to me this day thy birthright.' [32]And Esau said, 'Behold! I *am* going to die: and (wherefore =) for-what-*good is* this birthright to me?' [33]And Jacob said, 'Swear to me (as) this day': and he sware to him, and he sold his birthright to Jacob. [34]And Jacob gave to Esau bread and pottage of lentiles, and he ate and drank, and he arose and went; and Esau despised the birthright.

**26.** [1]And there was a famine in the land, besides the first famine† which was in the days of Abraham. And Isaac went unto Abimelech, king of the Philistines, to Gerar. [2]And Jehovah appeared to him, and said, 'Go not down to Egypt; abide in the land which I will speak-of unto thee. [3]Sojourn in this land, and I will be with thee, and I will bless thee: for to thee and to thy seed will I give all these lands, and I establish the oath which I sware to Abraham thy father.'

[6]And Isaac dwelt in Gerar. [7]And the men of the place asked him concerning his wife, and he said, 'She *is* my sister': for he feared to say 'my wife,' 'lest,' said he, 'the men of the place slay me on account of Rebekah, for fair of form is she.' [8]And it came to pass that the days grew-long to him there; and Abimelech, king of the Philistines, looked behind the window, and saw and beheld Isaac (laughing =) caressing Rebekah his wife. [9]And Abimelech called to Isaac, and said, 'Behold! (only thy wife *is* she =) she is nothing else but thy wife: and how saidst thou, 'She is my sister'? and Isaac said unto him, 'For I said, Lest I die on account of her.' [10]And Abimelech said, 'What hast thou done to us? Within-a-little one of the people had lain with thy wife, and thou hadst brought guilt upon us.' [11]And Abimelech commanded all the people, saying, 'He-that-toucheth this man and his wife shall surely die.'

[12]And Isaac sowed in that land, and found in that year a hundred measures;

---

* This expression includes Ishmael, the son of Hagar, as well as the above-named sons of Keturah: since the account of Hagar's harsh expulsion with her son, xxi.9–21, has been (as we suppose) *cancelled*.

† Referring to **12.**10–20, which belongs to this set of passages; while, now that **20.**1–18 has been cancelled, *Abimelech* can be brought upon the scene for *Isaac*, instead of, as there, about a century earlier for *Abraham*.

and Jehovah blessed him. [13]And the man grew-great, and went growing continually, until he grew very great. [14]And he had cattle of flocks, and cattle of herds, and (a great service) many servants; and the Philistines envied him. [15]And all the wells, which his father and servants dug, in the days of Abraham his father, the Philistines stopped them, and filled them with dust. [16]And Abimelech said unto Isaac, 'Go from among us; for thou art much stronger than we.' [17]And Isaac went from thence, and encamped in the vale of Gerar, and dwelt there.*

[18]And Isaac's servants dug in the vale, and they found there a well of living water. [20]And the herdsmen of Gerar strove with Isaac's herdsmen, saying, 'The water is ours': and he called the name of the well Esek (= 'contention'); for there they contended with him. [21]And they dug another well, and they strove also about that; and he called its name Sitnah (= 'hatred'). [22]And he removed from thence, and dug another well, and they strove not about that; and he called its name Rekhoboth (= 'streets' or 'room'), and he said, 'For now Jehovah hath-made-room for us, and we shall fructify in the land.'

[23]And he went-up from thence to Beersheba. [24]And Jehovah appeared unto him in that night, and said, 'I *am* the Elohim of Abraham thy father: fear not, for I *am* with thee, and will bless thee, and will multiply thy seed for the sake of Abraham my servant.' [25]And he built there an altar, and called on the name of Jehovah.

[26]And Abimelech went unto him from Gerar, and Ahuzzath his friend, and Phichol, captain of his host. [27]And Isaac said unto them, 'Why have ye come unto me, (and) since ye hate me, and sent me forth from among you?' [28]And they said, 'We have surely seen that Jehovah was with thee, and we said, Let there be, I pray, an oath between us, between us and thee, and let us cut a covenant with thee, [29](if thou shalt =) that thou shalt not do with us evil, as we have not touched thee, as we have done with thee only good, and have sent-thee-forth in peace: thou now *art* blessed of Jehovah.'

[30]And he made for them a feast, and they ate and drank. [31]And they rose-early in the morning and sware one to another: and Isaac sent them forth, and they went-away from him in peace. [32]And it came-to-pass on that day, that Isaac's servants came and told him concerning the well, which they dug; and they said to him, 'We have found water.' [33]And he called it Sheba, (='swearing';) therefore the name of the city *is* Beer-sheba unto this day.†

E(**26.** 34,35).

**27.** [1]And it came-to-pass that Isaac was old and his eyes were (dim above seeing) too dim to see; and he called Esau his elder son, and said unto him, 'My son!'

---

* Probably *v.*18(J[1]) was also meant to have been cancelled, together with xxi 21–32, to which it seems to have originally referred. Accordingly, the expressions of it are repeated in *v.*15, as if to supply the information which it contained, in connection with the new insertion.

† This account of the origin of the name 'Beersheba' is substituted, as we suppose, for xxi.25–32, which has been cancelled.

and he said unto him, 'Behold me!' [2]And he said, 'Behold, I pray! I am old; I know not the time of my death. [3]And now, take, I pray, thy weapons, thy quiver and thy bow, and go to the field, and hunt for me venison. [4]And make for me dainties, as I love; and bring to me, and I will eat, that my soul may bless thee before I die.'

[5]And Rebekah *was* hearing at Isaac's speaking unto Esau his son; and Esau went to the field to hunt game to bring. [6]And Rebekah said unto Jacob her son, saying, 'Behold! I heard thy father speaking unto Esau thy brother, saying, [7]'Bring for me venison, and make for me dainties, and I will eat, and bless thee before Jehovah, before my death.' [8]And now, my son, hearken to my voice, for what I *am* commanding thee. [9]Go, I pray, unto the flock, and take for me from thence two good kids of the goats; and I will make them dainties for thy father as he loves. [10]And thou shalt bring them to thy father, and he shall eat, in order that he may bless thee before his death.' [11]And Jacob said unto Rebekah his mother, 'Behold! Esau my brother *is* a hairy man, and I *am* a smooth man. [12]Perhaps, my father will feel me, and I shall be in his eyes as a deceiver; and I shall bring upon me a curse and not a blessing.' [13]And his mother said to him, 'Upon me thy curse, my son! only hearken to my voice, and go take for me.'

[14]And he went and took, and brought to his mother: and his mother made dainties, as his father loved. [15]And Rebekah took the (raiment of desires) best raiment of her elder son Esau, which *was* with her in the house, and she clothed Jacob her younger son. [16]And the skins of the kids of the goats she put-as-clothing upon his hands, and on the smooth of his neck. [17]And she gave the dainties and the bread, which she had made, into the hand of Jacob her son. [18]And he entered unto his father, and said, 'My father!' and he said, 'Behold me! who *art* thou, my son?' [19]And Jacob said unto his father, 'I *am* Esau, thy first-born: I have done according as thou spakest unto me: arise, I pray, sit, and eat of my venison, in order that thy soul may bless me.' [20]And Isaac said unto his son, 'How is it that thou hast hastened to find, my son?' And he said, 'For Jehovah thy Elohim made-*it*-to-meet before me.' [21]And Isaac said unto Jacob, 'Come-near, I pray, and I will feel thee, my son, whether thou *art* this my son Esau, or not.' [22]And Jacob came-near unto Isaac his father, and he felt him, and said, 'The voice *is* the voice of Jacob, but the hands *are* the hands of Esau.' [23]And he discerned him not,—for his hands were as the hands of Esau his brother, hairy,—and he blessed him. [24]And he said, '*Art* thou this my son Esau?' And he said, 'I *am*.' [25]And he said, 'Come-near to me, and I will eat of my son's venison, in-order-that my soul may bless thee': and he came-near to him, and he ate; and he brought to him wine, and he drank.

[26]And Isaac his father said unto him, 'Come near, I pray, and kiss me, my son.' [27]And he came-near, and kissed him; and he smelt the smell of his garments, and blessed him, and said:

'See! the smell of my son *is* as the smell of a field,
Which Jehovah hath blessed.

[28]And let ELOHIM give thee
Out of the dew of heaven,
And out of the fatness of the earth,
And plenty of corn and must.
[29]Let peoples serve thee,
And folks bow-down to thee;
Be lord over thy brethren,
And let the sons of thy mother bow-down to thee;
Those cursing thee *be* cursed,
And those blessing thee *be* blessed!'

[30]And it-came-to-pass, as Isaac had finished to bless Jacob, and Jacob had only just gone away-from the face of Isaac his father, that Esau his brother came-in from his hunting. [31]And he also made dainties, and brought to his father, and said to his father, 'Let my father arise, and eat of his son's venison, in order that thy soul may bless me.' [32]And Isaac his father said to him, 'Who *art* thou?' And he said, 'I *am* thy first-born son, Esau.' [33]And Isaac trembled with an exceedingly great trembling, and said, 'Who then is he that hunted venison, and brought to me, and I ate (out) of all, when thou hadst not yet come-in, and I blessed him? Also blessed shall he be!' [34]At Esau hearing his father's words, then he cried with an exceedingly great and bitter cry, and said to his father, 'Bless me, me also, my father!' [35]And he said, 'Thy brother came-in with subtilty, and took thy blessing.' [36]And he said, 'Is it (that he) because they called his name Jacob (=he supplants) *that* he has supplanted me these two times? My birthright he took, and behold! now he has taken my blessing.' And he said, 'Hast thou not reserved for me a blessing?' [37]And Isaac answered and said to Esau: 'Behold! I have placed him lord over thee, and all his brethren I have given to him for servants; and *with* corn and must I have supplied him: and what then shall I do for thee, my son?' [38]And Esau said unto his father, 'Hast thou *but* one blessing, my father? bless me, me also, my father!' and Esau lifted-up his voice, and wept. [39]And Isaac his father answered and said unto him:

'Behold! out of (or 'without') the fatness of the earth shall be thy dwelling,
And out of (or 'without') the dew of heaven from above.
[40]And by thy sword shalt thou live,
And thy brother shalt thou serve;
And it-shall-come-to-pass, when thou shalt have dominion,
That shalt thou break his yoke from-off thy neck.'

[41]And Esau hated Jacob for the blessing with which his father had blessed him; and Esau said in his heart, 'The days of my father's mourning are near, and I will slay Jacob my brother.' [42]And the words of Esau, her eldest son, were told to Rebekah, and she sent and called to Jacob her younger son, and said unto him, 'Behold! Esau, thy brother, comforteth himself over thee to slay thee. [43]And now, my son, hearken to my voice, and rise, flee thee to Laban my brother to Charran. [44]And thou shalt dwell with him some days, until that thy brother's fury turn-back, —[45]until thy brother's anger turn-back from thee, and he forget what thou hast done

to him, and I shall send, and take thee from thence. Wherefore shall I be bereaved also of both of you in one day?'

[45]And Rebekah said unto Isaac, 'I am weary of my life because of the daughters of Heth: if Jacob is for taking a wife out of the daughters of Heth, as these out of the daughters of the land, what-for is my life to me?'

EJ$^2$J$^3$(**28.1—29.30**). [31]And Jehovah saw that Leah was hated, and He opened her womb; (and) but Rachel *was* barren. E(*v.*32$^{ab}$); [32cd]for she said, 'Because Jehovah hath seen at my affliction; for now will my husband love me.' E(*v.*33$^a$), [33bc]and she said, 'For Jehovah hath heard that I am hated, and hath given me this also'; E(*v.*33$^d$). E(*v.*34$^a$), [34bcd]and she said, 'Now this-time will my husband be joined unto me; for I have borne to him three sons'; therefore (he) one called his name Levi. E(*v.*35$^a$), [35bc]and she said, 'This-time will I praise Jehovah'; therefore she called his name Judah: E(*v.*35$^d$).

E(**30.1**$^a$), [1b]and Rachel envied at her sister, and she said unto Jacob, 'Give-here to me children, and if not, I die!' [2]And Jacob's anger was kindled at Rachel, and he said, 'Am I in the place of Elohim, who hath kept-back from thee the fruit of the womb?' [3]And she said, 'Behold, my maiden Bilhah! Go-in unto her, and she shall bear upon my knees, and I also shall be built-up out of her.' E(*v.*4$^a$), [4b]and Jacob went-in unto her. E(*v.*5,6$^a$), [6b]'and also He hath heard at my voice, and hath given to me a son': therefore she called his name Dan. E(*v.*7,8$^a$), [8bc]'I have prevailed also'; E(*v.*8$^c$).

E(*v.*9–13). [14]And Reuben went-forth in the days of the wheat-harvest, and found love-apples in the field, and brought them unto Leah his mother. And Rachel said unto Leah, 'Give, I pray, to me of thy son's love-apples.' [15]And she said to her, 'Is it little thy taking my husband, and thou wouldst take also my son's love-apples?' And Rachel said, 'Therefore he shall lie with thee to-night for thy son's love-apples.' [16]And Jacob came out of the field in the evening, and Leah went-forth to meet him; and she said unto him, 'Thou shalt come, for I have certainly hired thee with my son's love-apples.' And he lay with her (in) that night. E(*v.*17,18$^a$,), [18b]'because I gave my maid to my husband'; E(*v.*18$^c$). E(*v.*19,20$^a$), [20b]'this-time my husband will dwell with me, because I have borne to him six sons'; E(*v.*20$^c$). E(*v.*21–24$^a$), [24b]saying, 'Jehovah shall add to me another son.'

J$^2$(*v.*25–27$^a$); [27b]'I have perceived, and Jehovah hath blessed me on account of thee.' [28]And he said, 'Mark-out thy hire (upon) for me, and I will give *it*.' [29]And he said unto him, 'Thou knowest how I have served thee, and how thy cattle was with me; [30]for it was little which thou hadst before me, and it has broken-forth to plenty, and Jehovah hath blessed thee by reason of me: and now when shall I make also for my house?'

J$^2$(*v.*31-42). [43]And the man broke-forth exceedingly, and he had much sheep, and maids, and servants, and camels, and he-asses.

**31.** [1]And he heard the words of Laban's sons saying, 'Jacob hath taken all which was our father's, and of that which was our father's hath he made this glory. J$^2$(*v.*2).

[3]And Jehovah said unto Jacob, 'Return unto the land of thy fathers, and to thy kindred, and I will be with thee.' EJ$^2$($v$.4–48$^a$); [48b]therefore (he) one called its name Galeed (='Heap of witness'), [49]and Mizpah (='watch-tower'), for he said, 'Let Jehovah watch between me and thee; for we shall be hidden one from another.' J$^2$($v$.51–55).

J$^2$(**32.**1,2). [3]And Jacob sent messengers before his face unto Esau his brother, to the land of Seir, the field of Edom. [4]And he commanded them, saying, 'Thus shall ye say to my lord, to Esau, Thus hath said thy servant Jacob, with Laban have I sojourned, and have tarried until now. [5]And I have men, and he-asses, sheep, and servants, and maids; and I have sent to tell my lord to find favour in thine eyes.'

[6]And the messengers returned unto Jacob, saying, 'We came unto thy brother, unto Esau; and also he *is* coming to meet thee, and four hundred men with him.' [7]And Jacob feared much, and he was distressed; and he divided the people that *were* with him, and the sheep, and the cattle, and the camels, into two camps. [8]And he said, 'If Esau shall come unto the one camp and smite it, then the remaining camp shall be an escape.'

[9]And Jacob said, 'Elohim of my father Abraham, and Elohim of my father Isaac, Jehovah that saidst unto me, 'Return to thy land and to thy kindred, and I will do-good with thee'! [10]I am less than all the mercies and than all the truth, which thou hast done with thy servant; for with my staff I crossed this Jordan, and now I have become two camps. [11]Deliver me, I pray, out of the hand of my brother Esau, for I fear him, lest he come and smite me, mother upon children. [12]And thou—thou saidst, I will surely do good with thee, and will place thy seed as the sand of the sea, which is not counted for multitude.'

J$^2$($v$.13$^a$); [13b]and he took out of that which came by his hand an offering for Esau his brother,—[14]two hundred she-goats and twenty he-goats, two hundred ewes, and twenty rams, [15]thirty milch camels and their colts, forty cows and ten bulls, twenty she-asses and ten foals. [16]And he gave them into the hand of his servants, flock *and* flock, by itself; and he said unto his servants, 'Cross-over before me, and place a distance between flock and flock.' [17]And he commanded the first, saying, 'When Esau my brother shall meet thee, and ask thee, saying, Whose art thou? and whither goest thou? and whose are these before thy face?—[18]then thou shalt say, Thy servant's, Jacob's: a present it *is*, sent to my lord, to Esau; and behold! he also *is* behind us.' [19]And he commanded also the second, also the third, also all those going after the flocks, saying, 'According to this word shall ye speak unto Esau at your finding him. [20]And ye shall say, 'Behold! also thy servant Jacob *is* behind us': for he said 'I will cover his face with the present that goeth before my face, and afterwards I will see his face: perhaps, he may (lift-up my face=) forgive me.' [21]And the present past-over before him; and he spent-the-night on that night in the camp.

J$^2$($v$.22$^{aa}$); [22b]and he took his two wives, and his two maids, and his eleven boys; [23]and he took them, and passed-them-over the stream, and he passed-over all his. [24a]And Jacob was left by himself; J$^2$($v$.24$^b$–32).

**33.** [1]And Jacob lifted-up his eyes and saw and behold Esau coming! and with him four hundred men! and he divided the boys (upon) with Leah, and with Rachel, and with the two maids. [2]And he placed the maids and their boys first, and Leah and her boys behind, and Rachel and Joseph behind. [3]And he passed-over before them, and bowed-himself to the ground seven times until his drawing-near unto his brother. [4]And Esau ran to meet him, and embraced him, and fell upon his neck, and kissed him; and they wept. [5]And he lifted-up his eyes and saw the women and the boys, and said, 'Who are these of thine?' And he said, 'The boys whom Elohim hath granted to thy servant.' [6]And the maids drew-near, they and their lads, and bowed-themselves. [7]And Leah also drew near, and her boys, and bowed-themselves; and afterwards Joseph drew-near, and Rachel, and bowed-themselves. [8]And he said, 'What is all this camp of thine which I met?' And he said, 'To find favour in the eyes of my lord.' [9]And Esau said, 'I have abundance, my brother: (let these be to thee=) keep what is thine.' [10]And Jacob said, 'Nay! but if, I pray, I have found favour in thine eyes, then take my present from my hand; for therefore have I seen thy face like seeing the face of Elohim, and thou acceptedst me. [11]Take, I pray thee, my blessing which was brought to thee; because Elohim hath granted to me, and because that I have all'; and he pressed on him, and he took it.

[12]And he said, 'Let us journey and go; and I will go over-against thee.' [13]And he said unto him, 'My lord knoweth that the lads are tender, and the sheep and the oxen giving-suck *are* (upon) with me: and, should one overdrive them one day, then all the sheep die. [14]Let my lord, I pray, pass-on before his servant; and I will lead-on at my slow-pace, according to the foot of the work which is before me, and according to the foot of the boys, until I shall come unto my lord to Seir.' [15]And Esau said, 'Let me leave, I pray, with thee out of the people who are with me.' And he said, 'Wherefore this? Let me find favour in the eyes of my lord.'

[16]And Esau returned on that day upon his way to Seir. [17]And Jacob journeyed to Succoth, and built for himself a house, and for his cattle he made booths; therefore (he) one called the name of the place 'Succoth' (*i.e.* 'booths'). $J^2$(*v.*18–20). $J^2$(**34.**1–31).

**35.** [1]And Elohim said unto Jacob, 'Arise, go-up to Beth-El, and dwell there; and make there an altar unto EL, which appeared unto thee at thy fleeing from the face of Esau thy brother.' [2]And Jacob said unto his house, and unto all that *were* with him, 'Put-away the (Elohim of abroad) strange Elohim, which *are* in the midst of you, and cleanse yourselves, and change your raiment. [3]And let us arise and go-up to Beth-El, and I will make there an altar unto EL, who answered me in the day of my distress, and was with me in the way which I went.' [4]And they gave unto Jacob all the strange Elohim which *were* in their hands, and the pendants which *were* in their ears; and Jacob concealed them beneath the terebinth which *was* (with) by Shechem. $J^2$(*v.*5,6). [7]And he built there an altar, and called to the place El-Beth-El, for there ELOHIM revealed-themselves unto him at his fleeing from the face of his brother.

E*($v.16^a$); $16^b$ and Rachel (bare) gave-birth, and she (made-hard) had a hard time in her bearing. $17$And it came-to-pass, at her having a hard time in her bearing, that the midwife said to her, 'Fear not! this son also shall be thine.' $18$And it came-to-pass, at the giving-forth of her soul, for she died, that she called his name 'Benoni' (='son of my sorrow'); (and) but his father called to him 'Benjamin' (=son of the right-hand). EJ²($v.19,20$); $20b$ that is the pillar of Rachel's tomb unto this day. EJ²($v.21$–29).

E(**36**.1–19).

$20$ These are the sons of Seir the Horite, the inhabitants of the land: Lotan, and Shobal, and Zibeon, and Anah, $21$and Dishon, and Ezer, and Dishan: these are the clans of the Horite, the sons of Seir, in the land of Edom.

$22$And the sons of Lotan were Hori and Hemam; and Lotan's sister was Timnah.

$23$And these were the sons of Shobal, Alvan, and Manahath, and Ebal, Shepho, and Onam.

$24$And these were the sons of Zibeon, Vayyah and Anah; this was the Anah who found the hot-springs in the wilderness, in his feeding the he-asses of Zibeon his father.

$25$And these *were* the sons of Anah, Dishon, and Aholibamah, the daughter of Anah.

$26$And these *were* the sons of Dishon, Hemdan, and Eshban, and Ithran, and Cheran.

$27$ These the sons of Eser, Bilhan, and Zaavan, and Akan.

$28$ These the sons of Dishan, Uz, and Aran.

$29$ These are the clans of the Horite; clan Lotan, clan Shobal, clan Zibeon, clan Anah, $30$clan Dishon, clan Ezer, clan Dishan. These are the clans of the Horite, *belonging* to their clans in the land of Seir.

E($v.31$–$35^{abd}$), $35c$who smote Midian in the field of Moab. E($v.36$–43).

EJ(**37**.1–**50**.26).

---

THE DEUTERONOMISTIC PASSAGES IN GENESIS.

**6.** $4$*The Nephilim (giants) were in the earth in those days; and also afterwards, when the sons of* ELOHIM *went in unto the daughters of Man, and they bare to them, these were the Mighty-Ones which were of old; the men of a name.*

**10.** $8$*And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a Mighty-one in the earth.* $9$*He was a Mighty-One in hunting before Jehovah: therefore it is said, 'As Nimrod, the Mighty-One in hunting before Jehovah.'* $10$*And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar.* $11$*Out of that*

---

* As before, we suppose that $v.9$–15 was meant to have been cancelled for the reasons stated in (294).

*land he went to Assyria, and built Nineveh, and Rehoboth-Ir, and Calah,* [12]*and Resen, between Nineveh and Calah: that was the great city.*

**15.** [1]*After these things the word of Jehovah (was) came unto Abram in the vision, saying, 'Fear not, Abram! I* am, *a shield to thee: thy reward* is *very great.'* [2]*And Abram said, 'Adonai-Jehovah, what wilt thou give to me, (and) for I* am *going childless, and the (son of possession) possessor of my house, a Damascene* is *he, Eliezer.'* [3]*And Abram said, 'Lo! to me thou hast not given seed, and behold! a son of my house* is *inheriting me.'*

[4]*And behold! the word of Jehovah* came *unto him, saying, 'This* one *shall not inherit thee: but* one, *who shall go-forth out of thy bowels, he shall inherit thee.'* [5]*And he brought him without, and said, 'Look, I pray, heavenward, and number the stars, if thou art able to number them': and He said to him, 'Thus shall thy seed be.'* [6]*And he believed in Jehovah, and He reckoned it to him* as *righteousness.*

[7]*And He said unto him, 'I* am *Jehovah, which brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees to give to thee this land to possess it.'* [8]*And he said, 'Adonai-Jehovah, by what shall I know that I shall possess it?'* [9]*And he said unto him, 'Take for me a three-year-old heifer, and a three-year-old she-goat, and a three-year-old ram, and a turtle-dove, and a young-pigeon.'* [10]*And he took to him all these, and divided them in the midst, and (gave) set (man) each its part to meet its neighbour; and the birds he divided not.* [11]*And the fowls came down upon the carcasses, and Abram drove them off.*

[12]*And the sun was at the (going) setting, and a deep-slumber fell upon Abram, and behold a terror of great darkness falling upon him!* [13]*And he said to Abram, 'Know assuredly that thy seed shall be a sojourner in a land not theirs, and they shall serve them, and they shall oppress them four hundred years.* [14]*And also the nation, whom they shall serve, I (*am *judging) will judge; and afterwards they shall come out with great gain.* [15]*And thou—thou shalt go unto thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old-age.* [16]*And in the fourth generation they shall return hither; for the iniquity of the Amorite* is *not complete as yet.'*

[17]*And the sun was gone, and it was dusk, and behold a furnace of smoke and a flame of fire, which passed between those pieces!* [18]*In that day Jehovah cut with Abram a covenant, saying, 'To thy seed I do give this land, from the river of Egypt as far as the great River, the River Euphrates,—*[19]*the Kenite and the Kenizzite, and the Kadmonite,* [20]*and the Hittite, and the Perizzite, and the Rephaim,* [21]*and the Amorite, and the Canaanite, and the Girgashite, and the Jebusite.'*

**18.** [18]*And Abraham shall surely become a nation great and strong, and by him shall be blessed all nations of the earth.* [19]*For I know him that he will command his children and his house after him, and they shall keep the way of Jehovah, to do righteousness and justice, that Jehovah may bring upon Abraham what He spake concerning him.*

**22.** [14]*And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovah-Jireh (= Jehovah-will-see), (which) as it is said this day, 'In the mount Jehovah-Jireh!'* [15]*And the*

*angel of Jehovah called unto Abraham a second time out of the heaven,* [16]*and said, 'By Myself have I sworn,' saith Jehovah, 'that because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son,* [17]*(that) I will surely bless thee, and I will surely multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, and as the sand which is on the lip of the sea, and thy seed shall inherit the gate of his enemies.* [18]*And by thy seed shall all nations of the earth bless themselves, because that thou hast hearkened unto my voice.'*

**24.** [59]*And they put forth Rebekah their sister, and her nurse, and Abraham's servant, and his men.* [60]*And they blessed Rebekah, and said to her,—*

*'Our sister, become thou thousands of ten thousands!*
*And let thy seed inherit the gate of his enemies!'*

**26.** [a]*And I multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven; and I give to thy seed all these lands; and by thy seed shall all nations of the earth bless themselves:* [b]*because that Abraham observed my charge, my statutes, my commandments, and my laws.*

**35.** [8]*And Deborah, Rebekah's nurse, died, and she was buried beneath Bethel under the oak; and (he) one called its name Allon-Bachuth (='oak of weeping').*

### Explanatory Notes.

**14.** [21] *that is Zoar.'* [24] *that is the Salt Sea.'* [71] *that is Kadesh.'* [81] *that is Zoar.'* [178] *that is the king's vale.'*

**28.** [21] *that is Hebron.'* [191] *that is Hebron.'*

**35.** [6] *that is Bethel.'* [191] *that is Bethlehem.'*

**36.** [43] *that is Esau the father of Edom.'*

**48.** [71] *that is Bethlehem.'*

# CHAPTER XIX.

## THE PHŒNICIAN ORIGIN OF THE NAME JEHOVAH.

316. It is plain that the Elohist has intentionally abstained from using the name 'Jehovah,' till he had given the account of its revelation to Moses in E.vi.2-7. He *meant*, therefore, as we have said, to imply that it was literally *not known* till the time of Moses: and the words in E.vi.3,—

'I appeared unto Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, by El Shaddai; but (by) my name Jehovah was I not known to them'—

were really intended by him to be understood in this sense, which is their most obvious and natural meaning.

The Elohist, then, meant to teach his people that the name 'Jehovah' *was not the name which their great forefathers used* for the Deity. It was comparatively a modern name,—at the most, only three or four centuries old—and was first revealed to living man at the time of the Exodus.

317. On the other hand, we find the Jehovist habitually using the name 'Jehovah' from the first, putting it into the mouth of Eve, iv.1, and saying that from the time of Seth men 'began to call upon the name of Jehovah.' And, in short, he represents the name as thoroughly well-known, not only to the Patriarchs and their wives and families, but to the *Philistines*, xxvi.28,29, and *Aramæans*, xxiv.31,50,51, generally. This contradiction shows us at once that the Jehovist did *not* believe implicitly in the Elohistic account of the origin of the Name, and for some reason thought it best to carry back that origin to the

most distant ages of mankind. And from this fact alone,—independently of all other considerations,—we may infer at once that the account in E.vi.2-7 is not to be taken as historically true.

318. But, if we come to this conclusion,—to which indeed we are compelled not by this reason only, but (as we have shown) by a multitude of others,—the question must arise, *What did the Elohist mean* by giving this account at all? *Some* special object he must have had in writing this remarkable passage, and in deliberately adapting the whole preceding part of his narrative to it, by never using the name 'Jehovah' till he has introduced it in E.vi.2. I can conceive no other reason for such a proceeding than his knowledge of the fact that the name *was* comparatively new to the Hebrews,—that they really *did not know it before the Exodus*, but had become acquainted with it in some way *during* or *since* that event,—that this name, though in use at the time when this author wrote, was not yet in very general use,—and that he wished to commend it to the people, by means of this story, which the disciples of his prophetical school would impart to them, as the Name most fitted to express the One True and Living God—'HE IS'—the self-existent Being and source of life—or 'The Eternal,' *αἰώνιος*, Bar.iv.10,14,20,24,25,v.2, 'WHO WAS AND IS AND IS TO BE.'

319. Accordingly, I suggested (in Part II) that the Hebrews may have adopted the name 'Jehovah,' subsequently to their entrance into Canaan, from some source or other,—that it may have been gradually getting into use more and more freely, but slowly at first, till the time of Samuel,—and by him may have been adopted with entire satisfaction, as the best Name by which to speak of the Deity, and as such may have been commended highly, by his own practice as well as by this Elohistic narrative, to the veneration of the people. I pointed out some signs which seemed to indicate that, perhaps, the Name only began to be used in Proper Names in Samuel's time, and then in the case of

his own sons. And I showed that, at all events, there were strong indications pointing to the fact, that in Samuel's days the Name first began to be made the Name of the National God of Israel—derived, perhaps, from some *foreign* source.

320. This, I have since found, is also the view expressed by HARTMANN, in his *Hist. Krit. Forschung* &c., (1831), *p.*817 :—

> If, from the consideration of all these phenomena, we are led to the conclusion that between *Phœnicia* and Palestine there must have existed a mutual connection in a religious point of view, it cannot appear improbable to assume that the name 'Jehovah' was derived from the same source, but was stamped, so to speak, as a peculiar, consecrated designation, by being associated with the holiest ideas. If this conjecture is well-grounded, then this name cannot have been transplanted into the religious phraseology of the Israelites *earlier than the age of David.*

Von BOHLEN also, I.*p.*150–153, (HEYWOOD'S Ed.), fixes the introduction of this name among the Hebrews *about the age of David.*

And Von der ALM, one of the latest authorities on this subject, in his *Theol. Briefe* (1863), I.*p.*524, concludes thus :—

> There is reason to suppose that the name 'Jehovah' came over first from *Phœnicia* to the Hebrews *in the time of Samuel.*

321. Thus the above conjecture, which by many of my critics has been treated as only a rash assumption, utterly wanting in probability, has, at least, the support of three eminent continental critics, and may deserve to be considered thoughtfully on its own merits, and not simply dismissed as unworthy of close consideration. There are facts, it will be seen, derived not only from the criticism of the Pentateuch, but from researches into the early history of the Phœnician people, which confirm it strongly. I must repeat, however, that this particular question, as to the earlier or later use of the word 'Jehovah' in Israel, however it may be settled, is not of any vital consequence to the 'great main-point' of the argument.

322. It would be a matter of great interest, certainly, in an historical point of view, if we were able to determine with some approach to probability the age when this Name became first

known to the Hebrews. The settlement of the question, in one way or another, would help to throw light on other points in their history. And, as far as my general argument is concerned, I should gladly, if I could honestly do so, accede to the view maintained by many liberal critics—including EWALD and KUENEN—as well as by defenders of the traditionary view, *viz.* that the name was first brought into use among the Hebrews in the age of Moses. I have said already (II.340)—

> If it were right to wish any such fact of history to be other than it really is, one would rather *desire* such a solution of the present difficulty, and gladly embrace it.

But I cannot resist the force of the evidence, which now lies before me in a much stronger light even than when I published the Second Part of my work.

323. Before proceeding, however, to set forth more distinctly the reasons for the conclusion to which I have come on this question, it may be well to consider the view of EWALD, who has lately been commended (and justly) in England, as one of the most conservative of liberal critics. He writes as follows, *Gesch. d. V. I.* II.*p.*203:—

> From the above it might be readily imagined that Moses might, perhaps, have *invented* this Name (Jahveh). But many indications are opposed to this supposition. Thus we find the abbreviation 'Jah,' which is only employed in poetry, and only used rarely, and that by later writers, yet already occurring in very ancient songs or fragments of songs (E.xv.2, xvii.16*)—and except in these two very ancient passages, and Is.xxxviii.11, Jah is only used,—but that more frequently,—by the later poets. Further, *the name has no clear radical signification in Hebrew,*—which would be scarcely conceivable, if it owed its origin to Moses or his time. The chief point, however, is this, that, as far as we know, certainly no other person of antiquity before Moses, except *Jochebed,* the mother of Moses himself, shows any trace [in his or her name] of the Divine Name. This leads us to the conjecture that, though the

* Both these passages are, as I believe, of much later date than EWALD supposes. With respect to the former of them Prof. KUENEN, who once held it to be ancient, has now written to me,—'I cannot deny that you have made the Mosaic origin of this Song appear much more doubtful.' KUEN. *Eng. Ed. p.*107. But this does not at all affect the present question.

Name 'Jahveh,' (formed like the well-known 'Jacob,' &c.) was in use, no doubt, already in the pre-Mosaic time as a Divine Name,—and, in fact, all other simple Divine Names, and words of more recondite meaning, fall back into this distant primeval time,—yet *in the earlier times it was only used in the family of the ancestors of Moses on the mother's side.* It will thus have been properly the special name for the Deity in this family, as we may easily suppose to have been consistent with the religion of the Israelites in the pre-Mosaic times. It remains still certain, however, that first through Moses, as the great son of the mother of this single house, it obtained its significance among the community.

324. Thus EWALD, though so conservative in his general views, is obliged to give up the idea of the statement in E.vi.2–7 being historically true, and does not believe that the Name was revealed for the first time, as there described, directly to Moses from Jehovah Himself. He does not think it likely that Moses 'invented' the Name. But he supposes that it was previously in use among the members of his mother's family, and so was commended to the people by Moses, and bound up indissolubly with the Institutions of the Mosaic Law. And he writes, II.*p.*202:—

Beyond all doubt Moses made use of this Name in announcing his revelations, whenever he spoke as a prophet, and so stamped it to be the chief Name, the Name of Power, in the new community.

And this is also the view expressed by KUENEN, *Eng. Ed. p.*138.

325. I need hardly say that the above account of the matter differs quite as much from the traditionary view as that of HARTMANN, Von BOHLEN, and Von der ALM, or my own. But it appears to me to be far more improbable. It will be seen to be based mainly—if not wholly—on the assumption, that the name 'Jochebed' (which is compounded with the name 'Jehovah,' in the form 'Jo' or 'Jeho,') was *really* the name of the mother of Moses. Thus both these eminent authors, while admitting the unhistorical character, in this and other matters, of the history of the Pentateuch,—while abandoning the literal accuracy of E.vi.2–7, and rejecting the traditionary belief of the Name having first been revealed supernaturally to Moses,—yet cling

tenaciously to certain *details* of the narrative, as, for instance, to the historical reality of the name 'Jochebed.'

326. But, if this was really known to have been the name of the mother of Moses, how strange it must seem that in the account of Moses' birth, E.ii.1, it is stated merely—

'There went a man of the house of Levi, and took a daughter of Levi,'—

and that throughout the whole narrative we read only of 'the woman,' *v.*2, 'the child's mother,' *v.*8, 'the woman,' *v.*9,—never of 'Jochebed.' It seems plain that the writer of this part of the narrative did *not* know her name; and it can scarcely be doubted that E.vi.20,xxvi.59, where the name 'Jochebed' is given to her, are later interpolations of no historical value. At any rate, as Dr. GEDDES says, I.*p.*180, while he receives the account in E.vi.2–7 of the Mosaic origin of the name—

This single name 'Jochebed,' whencesoever it be derived, or whensoever it was given, cannot stand as a proof that the Name 'Jehovah' was known priorly to Moses, against so positive a testimony as that of this passage in Exodus.

327. But EWALD'S own words contain, as it seems to me, decisive confirmation of the view which I have expressed, *viz.* that the Name 'Jehovah' could not have been commended to the reverence of the whole community, as a Name most high and holy, and wrought into their most sacred Institutions, by the constant and earnest efforts of Moses himself,—not to speak of those efforts having been continued incessantly for 'forty' years together, according to the account in the Exodus. For EWALD writes, II.*p.*202,203 :—

From the time of Moses onwards, the Name (Jahveh) runs through a quite peculiar rich history, which it is very instructive to follow more closely. Though still, *for some centuries afterwards, not very much used in common speech*, it became by degrees general and very common, so that (only to notice this here,) (i) the oldest narrator, [who, according to EWALD, wrote E.xxi–xxiii,] can still name God everywhere 'Elohim,'—(ii) the 'Book of Origins,' [corresponding generally in EWALD to our *Elohistic* narrative,] at least from that moment in the life of Moses onwards, makes it a rule to use the name 'Jahveh,' and (iii) the *fourth* narrator is the first to introduce 'Jahveh' from the Creation onwards. Seldom employed at first in the community for the formation of Proper Names, [*i.e.* by

prefixing 'Jo' or 'Jeho' or affixing 'Jah' or 'Jahu']—so that Moses himself according to a beautiful legend, must change the name of Hoshea, his faithful successor, into *Jo*shua, in order to retain more firmly—and especially in the mind of this his young friend and confidant—the remembrance of the new religion, it becomes by degrees more and more generally applied. Nay, in the times of the later kings of Judah, it is used in this way so freely that one might almost suppose it was meant to bear everywhere the Name in view—a clear proof how deeply at that time, at all events, this religion had mixed itself with the manners of the age. On the other hand, in the *pre*-Mosaic age, with *one single exception* ['Jochebed'], such names are entirely wanting. Nay, *even in the age of Moses*, besides 'Joshua' as above, *no other similar man's name occurs*; whereas at this time very many names were compounded with El, and perhaps others with Shaddai.

328. But, surely, if Moses had really urged solemnly upon his people the adoption of this Name,—if he had used it habitually himself in his legislation, and of course encouraged or required its use by others,—it is incredible that it should still have remained '*for some centuries not very much used*' in the common speech of Israel. It need hardly be said that the *fact* itself here stated by EWALD, of which there is no doubt, is altogether fatal to the assumption that the records in the Pentateuch are all historically true: since in these the Name is put freely in the mouth of *any one*, whether *Hebrew* or *Heathen*, as the Philistine king Abimelech, G.xxvi.28, or the Aramæan Prophet Balaam, N.xxii–xxiv, who is actually made to say,—

'I cannot go beyond the word of Jehovah *my* Elohim,' xxii.18.

It implies also that these narratives, in which 'Jehovah' is so freely employed, were composed in a later age, by writers using the language of their own time.

329. I repeat, however, it seems incredible that, if Moses really during his lifetime commended with all his influence, and enforced by his own example, the use of this Name to his people, —aided also, of course, by the influence and example of his officers and by that of the Priesthood,—mixing it up with all their laws and institutions, the Ten Commandments, the formula of blessing, N.vi.23–27, the words with which each movement of the Ark in the wilderness began and ended, N.x.35,36,—setting

it in the front of Joshua's name,—making it, in short, the very symbol and watchword of their religion,—it was still, nevertheless, 'for some centuries' not freely used by the people. If this fact, as stated by EWALD, is true,—and it certainly is, as I have shown more fully in Part II,—then the only reasonable inference seems to me to be that it was *not* really introduced by Moses,—that it was *not* commended in this way by him to the people of Israel at all,—in other words, that it was brought into use in Israel in a later age, and, as we see reason to believe, either in or not long before the time of Samuel, after which, confessedly, it began to be more freely used.

330. We come, then, now to consider the source from which, probably, the name 'Jehovah' may have come to the Hebrews. EWALD has told us (319) that this name 'has no clear radical signification in Hebrew'; and all philologists find a difficulty in deriving the word; though at the present time, by very general consent, the original form of the word is supposed to have been יַהְוֶה, 'Jahveh,' derived from הָוָה, *havah*, = הָיָה, *hayah*, 'to be,' and meaning 'HE IS': see KUENEN, *Eng. Ed.* *p.*134. But this uncertainty as to the proper origin and meaning of the word suggests the possibility, as I have said in (II.452), that 'it may be, perhaps, a word of *foreign* origin.'

*Is there, then, any source from which, after the settlement of the Hebrew tribes in Canaan, such a Name might have been derived?*

331. Undoubtedly, there is, and, as we have seen, HARTMANN and Von der ALM have both referred the Name to a Phœnician origin. Let me first remind the reader that the 'Phœnicians' were simply 'Canaanites,' a fact which is recognised by 'Sidon' being named as the firstborn of Canaan in G.x.15. The Phœnicians, according to this, were the oldest of the Canaanite tribes; but they were of kindred origin with all the rest,—the Hittite, Jebusite, Amorite, &c,—who are named

as Sidon's brothers in G.x.15–18. Thus these tribes all practised, no doubt, substantially, the same religion, and spoke the same common language. And that language—the language of the Phœnicians—was undoubtedly the same, to all intents and purposes, as *Hebrew*. I have discussed this question at full length in (IV.Chap.XXIV); but the fact is undeniable, and in these days is universally recognised among scholars. The most decisive proof of it is given by the series of Phœnician inscriptions lately published by the authorities of the British Museum.

332. Whether, therefore, the Hebrews, on their arrival from Egypt, already spoke the language of Canaan, or whether, as some may suppose, they acquired it wholly, or acquired it more perfectly, *after* their settlement in Canaan, from constant intercourse with the inhabitants of the land, there is no room to doubt that they did mix freely with the tribes of Canaan, spoke their tongue, and adopted many of their practices, and more particularly their *religious* practices. That this was the the case, indeed, we are expressly told in many passages of the Book of Judges, *e.g.* Ju.ii.11–13, iii.5–7, x.6—

'The children of Israel did evil in the sight of Jehovah, and served Baalim, and they forsook Jehovah, the God of their fathers, which brought them out of the land of Egypt, and followed other gods, of the gods of the people round about them, and bowed themselves unto them, and provoked Jehovah to anger. And they forsook Jehovah, and served Baal and Ashtaroth.'

333. The above passages, it is true, appear to be interpolations by a later hand—perhaps that of the Deuteronomist—in the original narrative of the Judges. But the fact itself is confirmed as substantially true, by all the more authentic history of the Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings. There can be no reasonable doubt that the Israelites did very speedily after their entrance into Canaan assimilate their own practice to that of their heathen neighbours, serving their gods and adopting their forms of worship. It was not, indeed, literally

true that they 'forsook Jehovah,' if that Name, as we maintain, was not yet known to them as the Name of the Living God, the God of Israel. But they forsook the Living God Himself, if they brought with them any remains of the purer worship of a more primitive time, such as is shadowed forth to us in the Elohistic history of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and they—

'followed other gods of the gods of the people that were round about them, and served Baal and Ashtaroth.'

334. Now among these 'other gods,' the 'gods of the people round about them,' must have been most prominent the great Phœnician Deity, the SUN, who was worshipped with highest worship among them, as symbolising the energising, life-giving, power of Nature—the *male* principle,—while the Moon was regarded as the symbol of the recipient co-operating powers of Nature, the *female* principle. The Sun was worshipped under a great variety of names, among others under that of *Baal* (בַּעַל, 'Lord'), and *Adonis* (אֲדֹנִי, 'my Lord'). And both these names were used habitually for the Deity in Israel,—*e.g.* the former in proper names,* and the latter in the plural form 'Adonai' (אֲדֹנָי, 'my Lords') which is used wherever 'Lord' is used in the E.V., and not LORD, *e.g.* G.xv.2,8, xx.4, &c.

335. But of all the names used for the SUN there was one more august than any, a mysterious name, employed chiefly at the great Feast of Harvest, and expressed both by Heathen and Christian writers by the very same Greek letters, IAΩ, by

* These are Jerub*baal*, Ju.vi.32,—Esh*baal* (Saul's son) and Merib*baal* (Jonathan's), 1Ch.viii.33,34, *Baal*yadah (David's son), xiv.7, (which appear as Ish*bosheth*, Mephi*bosheth*, *El*yadah, 2S.ii.8, iv.4, v.16,)—*Baal*jah (David's warrior), 1Ch.xii.5, *Baal*hanan (David's officer), xxvii.28. *In the days of Saul and David*, therefore, there was no holy horror of the name *Baal*: it was used for 'Lord,' and as convertible with *El* or *Elohim*. So in Ju.ix.46 *El*-Berith is used for *Baal*-Berith, *v.*4: *comp.* also *Baal-hanan*, = 'Baal granted' with *El-hanan*, 2S.xxi.19, and with 'Elohim granted,' G.xxxiii.5,11, as also *Baal-jah* = 'Jehovah is Baal,' with *Jo-el* or *Eli-jah*, 'Jehovah is Elohim.' Still the peophets seem not to have liked the connecting Baal with Jehovah, since we find it nowhere in any psalm or prophecy, except Hos.ii.16.

which they express also the mysterious Hebrew name, יהוה. As this subject is of very great interest, and the work of MOVERS, who has written most learnedly upon Phœnicia and Phœnician matters, is probably not within the reach of many English readers, I have translated in App.III a portion of Chap.XIV of his 'Phönizie,' in which he discusses this Name of the Sun-God at length. It will be seen that MOVERS gives it as יַחְוֶה, *Yakhveh*, 'HE GIVES LIFE,' while, with most scholars, he reads the Hebrew word as יִהְוֶה, *Yahveh*, HE IS,—and, further, that he does *not* suppose any connection between these two words; so that his testimony will be free from the suspicion of being coloured to support the view which we maintain.

336. Among the passages which MOVERS produces in illustration of this matter, are two already quoted in (II.333), *viz.* the statement of DIODORUS SICULUS—

> It is said that among the Arimaspians Zathraustes professed that the good Divinity had given him his laws . . . and that among the Jews Moses made a similar claim with regard to the Deity named IAΩ;

and that of CLEM. AL. who says of the God of the Hebrews,—

> He is called IAOΥ, which is interpreted to mean WHO IS AND WHO SHALL BE.

And the reader will find other similar instances adduced in App.III. Thus we find the Hebrew Name of the Deity expressed in Greek by IAΩ or IAOΥ.

337. On the other hand, a famous oracle of the Clarian Apollo, quoted by MACROBIUS, *Sat.*I.18, says,—

> It was right that those knowing should hide the ineffable orgies; for in a little deceit there is prudence and an adroit mind. Explain that IAΩ is the Most High God of all,—in Winter Aïdes, and Zeus in commencing Spring, and Hēlios in Summer, and at the end of Autumn tender IAO.

And it is plain that IAΩ, here used as the Name of the 'Most High God,' denotes the Sun,—either the Autumnal Sun, if the second IAΩ is correct, or (if LOBECK's reading, 'tender *Adonis*,' be approved) then the Sun, generally, who in different seasons was worshipped under different names.

338. The other evidences of the existence of this name in

the Syro-Phœnician (*not* the *Tyrian**) worship, as the High Mysterious Name of their Great Deity, will be found given at length by MOVERS in the Appendix. And he sums up the result of his investigation as follows:—

IAΩ is the Sun-God at the different times of the year, with the predominant idea of Adonis, as the Harvest-Deity. In general, however, he represents a complex host of nature-deities, whose powers he comprehends in the meaning of his name, which was one full of mystery, and, according to SANCHONIATHON, was taught in the priestly mysteries by the oldest Phœnician hierophants.

339. Thus there can be no doubt that, however the Phœnician and Hebrew Names may have been originally written, there must have been a very close resemblance between them. And accordingly we find Phœnician Proper Names compounded with 'Jah' just exactly as Hebrew:—*e.g.* Ἀβδαῖος, JOSEPH. *c.Ap.*I.18, the name of a Tyrian Suffete (or public officer), which would be written עבדיה, and would appear in English as *Obadiah*='servant of Jah,' and *Bithias*, VIRG.I.738,=*Bithiah*, 1Ch.iv.18,—both of which names appear also in Hebrew, with 'El' instead of 'Jah,' in the forms *Abdiel, Bethuel.* In fact the difference between יחוה and יהוה is obviously of such a kind as strongly to suggest the derivation of the one name from the other. GESENIUS says of the letter ח, *Heb.Gr.*vi.2,—

While the Hebrew was a living language, this letter had two grades of sound, being uttered feebly in some words, and more strongly in others;

while he says of ה, (*Lex.*ה)—

*In the kindred dialects*, though not in the Hebrew itself, it is sometimes interchanged with ח.

Thus it cannot be a matter of surprise that the Phœnician יחוה should have become the Hebrew יהוה, or that both should be expressed by the same letters in Greek.

340. It may of course be suggested that the *Phœnician* name was derived from the *Hebrew.* For those who will maintain this, in despite of the proofs which have been adduced of

* The *Tyrian* Baal was called by the Greeks, not *Adonis*, but *Hercules*,—perhaps, הָרָכָל, *harachal*, 'he who goes about,' *viz.* the Sun: *comp.* Ps.xix.5,6.

the unhistorical character of the Pentateuchal story, it is impossible to say more than that such a supposition appears to us, with that evidence in our hands, to be wholly untenable. The whole body of proof, which we have had before us, seems to us to tend conclusively to this, that the Hebrews, after their settlement in Canaan, coming in contact with the ancient religion of the land, and adopting readily, as the Scripture tells us they did, the worship of the 'people round about them,' became by degrees acquainted with the Great Name of the Phœnician Deity, and that from this source has been derived their own mysterious name for the Deity.

341. How else, indeed, can we account for the fact, that in all their history—though the names are freely given of 'gods many' and 'lords many,' that have been the objects of idolatrous worship in Israel,—no mention is ever made of the name יהוה, the Great Name of the Greatest Deity of the people around them, and honoured with the highest reverence by the tribes, at all events, who lived in Northern Canaan? The Hebrews, soon after their entrance into Canaan, *must* have become acquainted with this mysterious name, and with the worship of the Phœnician Baal, renowned throughout those regions of Syria. Disposed, as they were, to follow the idolatries practised around them, they would surely have taken part at times in *this* worship also, and employed this sacred Name among the rest. If not *at first*, when they were new to the land and strange to its practices, and might therefore be expected not instantly to use a Name, which belonged rather to the higher mysteries of the Phœnician worship, yet surely in their latter days they cannot have remained in entire ignorance of it, or kept aloof from that particular worship,—more especially when we find that one of the special rites belonging to it was actually practised by the women of Israel, as we learn from Ez.viii.14, where the prophet is called to see the 'abomination' of the 'women weeping for Tammuz'; for 'Tammuz' was an-

other name for 'Adonis,' and this Syrian ceremony of first lamenting the death of the 'Lord' of all nature, and then 'on the third day' rejoicing at his resurrection, corresponds to the modern practice of seeing the old year out and the new year in.

342. How is it, then, that while we hear of 'Baal' and 'Ashera,'* of 'Moloch' and 'Astarte,' of 'Chemosh' and 'Rimmon,' of 'Baalim' and 'Ashtaroth' innumerable, we never read of the Hebrews worshipping Baal (the Sun) by this mysterious name יהוה? May the reason be that, although they *did* use this Name, as it would seem they *must* have used it, yet the devout writers of the history have never mentioned it, because it had been already adopted, or a kindred name of similar efficacy, by some of higher mind, such as Samuel and the prophets of his School, as being well fitted to express the 'Living God'—the 'Life-Giver'—the Source and Spring of all life to His creatures—whose glorious Nature had been in a measure more fully and perfectly revealed to their Inner Man?

343. In Natal, for instance, and in Zululand, we find the natives using the name Unkulunkulu, 'Great-Great-One,' to

* *Ashera* was different from *Astarte* (Ashtoreth), and seems, indeed, not to have been properly a goddess at all, but was probably only a *symbol* of the Moon-Goddess (Astarte). The name 'Ashera' means properly 'straight, upright,' from אָשַׁר *ashar*, 'be straight,' and was derived from the form of the image which symbolised the goddess, *viz.* a tall stem of a tree, representing the *phallus*, and hence called מִפְלֶצֶת, *miphletseth*, 'pudendum verendum,' 1K.xv.13, 2Ch.xv.16, or, as Jerome on Hos.iv says, *simulacrum Priapi*. This rude form points to a very high antiquity for the worship. The Western Asiatics in the oldest times, when they were still without artistic skill, used a conical stone as the symbol of the Sun-God, and the stem of a tree as that of the Moon-Goddess, which they planted on or near the stone upon the high-place. Hence the images of Baal are spoken of as '*broken*-down,' while those of Ashera were '*hewn*-down' and *burnt*, E.xxxiv.13, D.xii.3, Ju.vi.28, 2K.xviii.4., xxiii.6,15, *comp.* D.xvi.21, 'an Ashera of any wood (tree).' Von der Alm, i.*p.*509.

Probably in later days the form of the Ashera was modified by Phœnician art. In India the symbols of the Sun and Moon are still to be seen in innumerable instances combined in one form, the *Lingam-yoni*. In short, the use of the phallus as the symbol for the Sun has prevailed over almost all the world, and still exists in many countries, as in India, Japan, &c.

denote the Being, of whom they have faint confused conceptions, as the Maker of all things and all men. And many Christian Teachers have decided to adopt this Name, finding it well-suited to express the Deity, but endeavouring to give to it a higher and holier meaning than the untaught native would think of attaching to it. May not, in like manner, the great Hebrew Teacher, to whom first, in the depths of his own soul, had been revealed the grand idea of the One Only True and Living God,—whose spirit the Divine Spirit, the Educator of the Human Race, had quickened, to be the instrument of communicating that Divine gift, first to his fellow-countrymen, and then to his fellow-men of all ages,—have resolved to gather up, as it were, *this* name, so full of meaning, so august, from the sordid usage by which it was debased, in the idolatrous worship of the heathen tribes of Canaan, and in that of the ignorant multitude of his own people, and consecrate it to be the Name Most High, Most Holy, the proper designation henceforth of the God of Israel?

344. And this would be the more natural, if Israel had only recently been formed into one people under a king, as in the days of SAMUEL; since in those days each nation had its own special *Deity*, as well as its own *King*, according to the language of the people addressed to SAMUEL, 1S.viii.19—

'Nay! but we will have a king over us, that we also may be like all the nations, and that our king may judge us, and go before us, and fight our battles.'

And when Samuel reproaches them for rejecting their Divine *King*, 1S.x.19,xii.12,—if this account has any historical value,—may it not be that he had already begun to teach them to look up from 'the Earth and the Heaven' which Elohim had created, G.i.1—from the Sun and the Moon and the Stars, which His Word had made, G.i.14–19,—to put their trust in Jehovah, the Living God Himself, the Eternal King and Elohim of Israel?

345. The very fact, then, that no mention is made in the Scripture narrative anywhere of the Israelites worshipping the

Phœnician Baal under this name יהוה,—when we yet have every reason to believe that they *did* worship this Deity, (*comp.* Beth-*Shemesh*, 'House of the Sun,' Jo.xv.10, xix.22,38, xxi.16,&c. with Beth-*El*, 'House of God,') and *must* have used this name in his worship,—seems strongly to confirm our view, that the prophets and historians, who have recorded their doings in the Bible, have purposely abstained from mentioning this name in connection with idolatrous worship, not being willing to pollute the Name, which for them was sacred, by ranking it with Baal and Ashtoreth. The Zulus, in their heathen state, do not *worship* Unkulunkulu. But, if they did, and served Him in their ignorance with unworthy and superstitious rites, yet having now adopted that Name as the Name of God in our teachings and formularies, we should not be likely, in speaking of their heathen state, to represent it as part of their *heathenism* that they had known and worshipped *Unkulunkulu*.

346. But have we no sign in the Bible that the great body of the people of Israel *did* really worship the Phœnician Baal, and not the True and Living God, under the name 'JHVH'? What, then, is the meaning of Jephthah's offering his daughter 'as a burnt-sacrifice unto JHVH,' Ju.xi.31,39? Or how can we explain otherwise the fact that they worshipped JHVH with idolatrous rites and impure practices, not only in the high-places of Judah and Israel, but even in the very Temple at Jerusalem? May it not be that the astonishing confusion, which we notice in the accounts of their religious history, as recorded in the Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, is really due to this cause,—that, while a few of higher mind among them had clearer views of the service which the Living God required, and 'worshipped Jehovah' in spirit and in truth, yet to the eye of the multitude the name JHVH represented only the chief deity of the tribes of Canaan, the 'God of the land,' 2K.xvii.26,27, and so they defiled their worship with all manner of impurities?

# CHAPTER XX.

## THE CORRUPT WORSHIP OF JEHOVAH IN ISRAEL.

347. Let us consider for a moment some of these strange phenomena, as we find them recorded in the Bible histories. In Josiah's time,—nay, during *eighteen* years of that *good* king's reign,—there were even *in the Temple* at Jerusalem vessels 'made for Baal (the Sun) and for Ashera (the Moon) and for all the Host of Heaven,' 2K.xxiii.4. There were *then* also—

'idolatrous priests, whom the kings of Judah had ordained to burn incense in the high places in the cities of Judah, and in the places round about Jerusalem—they also that burned incense unto Baal, to the Sun and to the Moon and to the Planets (?), and to all the Host of Heaven,' 2K.xxiii.5.

There was an Ashera (E.V. 'grove,' but most probably a *phallus*, Movers, *Phön.* I.568–570, like the *Linga* of the Hindoos, or some other indecent symbol) *in the House of Jehovah*, *v.*6, and 'houses of Sodomites' *by the House of Jehovah*, *v.*7, horses and chariots of the Sun *at the entering in of the House of Jehovah*, *v.*11, and idolatrous altars were still left standing, which his grandfather Manasseh had made, *in the two courts of the House of Jehovah*, *v.*12.

348. There were still standing also 'before Jerusalem' the high-places which Solomon of old had built—

'for Ashtoreth the abomination of the Zidonians, and for Chemosh the abomination of the Moabites, and for Milcom the abomination of the children of Ammon,' *v.*13.

And let us remember always that these things existed *in the eighteenth year of Josiah, a pious king*, in the immediate neighbourhood of his own palace and the Temple. It is clear

that the idolatrous worship of all kinds, which thus manifestly prevailed in Jerusalem, while still the people professed to worship JHVH, Jer.vii.4, viii.8, Ez.xxiii.39, could not have been carried on without the co-operation of at least a portion of the priesthood. And, in fact, we not only read, as above (343), of 'idolatrous priests' in Josiah's time, 'ordained by the Kings of Judah,'—who were not, as might be supposed, *irregular* priests, since they 'ate of the unleavened bread among their brethren,' 2K.xxiii.9,—but Jeremiah directly charges the 'kings, princes, priests, and prophets' of Judah with being concerned in these idolatries, ii.26–28.

349. May we not now assume it as certain that, if Ashtoreth, the Moon, the chief *goddess* of the Phœnicians, was honoured by Solomon with a special high-place at Jerusalem, their great god also, the Sun, must have been worshipped, and his great name יחוה been heard, at Jerusalem? And these 'high-places,' it would seem, either remained as places of worship from Solomon's time to Josiah's, or, if they were destroyed by Hezekiah, they were again rebuilt by Manasseh, and used during his reign, and Amon's, and *eighteen years of Josiah's*, when the Great Reformation took place, and Josiah 'defiled' them—

'and he brake in pieces the images, and hewed down the Asheras, and filled their places with the bones of men,' *v.*14.

350. And there were other 'high-places,'—not only 'in the cities of Samaria, which the kings of Israel had made to provoke to anger,' *v.*19,—but in the 'cities of Judah' also under Josiah's government, 'from Geba to Beersheba,' among which are especially named the 'high-places of the gates,' which were 'on a man's left hand at the gate of the city,' *v.*8. The priests of these high-places of *Judah* were not put to death for their wickedness: only we are told—

'they came not up to the altar of Jehovah in Jerusalem; but they did eat of the unleavened bread among their brethren,' *v.*9;

that is, probably, they were allowed, notwithstanding their past

idolatrous practices, to keep the Great Passover, *v.*21–23, with the priests 'their brethren,' who officiated in the Temple at Jerusalem during the time of the Reformation, though they themselves were debarred from ministering. But the king slew ruthlessly—the Heb. Text says 'sacrificed upon the altars'—all the priests of the high-places in Samaria—

'and he burned men's bones upon them, and returned to Jerusalem,' *v.*20.

351. Were they killed *upon* or, perhaps only, killed *by*, the altars, and afterwards burnt upon them? However this may be, certain it is that the practice of human sacrifices was fearfully common in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem itself, if not within the very precincts of the Temple,—and it would seem at the high places generally,—during the reigns of many—if not of all—of the kings of Judah. We have seen one instance of this in the case of Jephthah's daughter. The 'hewing to pieces' of Agag by Samuel '*before Jehovah*,' 1S.xv.33, and the 'hanging-up *before Jehovah*' of Saul's seven sons, with David's full 'assent and consent,' 2S.xxi.9—an atrocious act of kingcraft, which, though represented as having some kind of sanction from Divine authority, *v.*1, yet leaves upon the character of David a brand as indelible, as his adultery with Bathsheba and his murder of her husband Uriah,—may be regarded, however, rather as political executions, than as regular sacrifices, though in each case the words are used 'before Jehovah.'

352. But that human sacrifices did prevail among the Israelites to an enormous extent is abundantly proved by the writings of the prophets; and it is a fact so little generally considered, yet throwing so much light upon the moral and religious history of Israel, that it may be well to exhibit fully before the reader some of the most striking proofs of it. It will be seen that *before* and even *during* the Captivity,—in Judah, as well as in Israel,—human sacrifices were freely offered,—that Jerusalem itself, under the very eyes of the

priests, was habitually profaned with the 'innocent blood' of firstborn children, who were made to 'pass through the fire,'—in other words, as we shall see, were burnt as sacrifices,—in honour of the God who was worshipped under the name of Molech or of Baal.

353. Let the reader consider well the following passages.

'The children of Judah have done evil in my sight, saith Jehovah: they have set their abominations in the House which is called by my name, to pollute it. And they have built the high-places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, *to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire*,—which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart.' Jer.vii.30,31.

'They have forsaken me, and have estranged this place, and have burned incense in it unto other gods, whom neither they nor their fathers have known, nor the kings of Judah, and *have filled this place* [? the Temple-courts] *with the blood of innocents*. They have built also the high-places of Baal, *to burn their sons with fire for burnt-offerings unto Baal*, which I commanded not, nor spake it, neither came it into my mind.' Jer.xix.4,5.

'Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils, and shed innocent blood, the blood of their sons and of their daughters, whom they sacrificed unto the idols of Canaan, and the land was polluted with blood.' Ps.cvi.37,38.

'Moreover he (Ahaz) burnt incense in the valley of the son of Hinnom, and *burnt his children in the fire*, after the abominations of the heathen whom Jehovah cast-out before the children of Israel.' 2Ch.xxviii.3.

[But in this last passage הִבְעִיר, 'burn,' is probably a mistake for הֶעֱבִיר, 'pass-through': the LXX. has διήγε.]

354. It is plain that in the above passages the phrase 'to shed innocent blood' is used with express reference to the sacrifice of young children, who were first *slain*, and then *burnt*—comp. G.xxii 10, where 'Abraham takes the knife to slay his son.' And it will be seen also that the expression 'pass through' means everywhere 'pass through the fire,' and is only an euphemism for dedicating by *burning*. Thus we read—

'Thou shalt not make any of thy seed *pass through* to Molech,' L.xviii.21;

*comp.* 'Whosoever he be of the children of Israel . . . *that giveth his seed* unto Molech, he shall surely be put to death,' L.xx.2.

'Thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations; there shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to *pass through the fire*,' D.xviii.9,10.

Thus Micah's words, vi.6,7, in Hezekiah's time acquire for us a special significance:—

'Wherewithal shall I come before Jehovah, and bow myself before the Most High God? . . . Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?'

355. But the full meaning of these formulæ, 'pass through to Molech,' 'give unto Molech,' 'pass through,' 'pass through the fire,' is shown distinctly by the following passage:—

'Thou shalt not do so unto Jehovah thy God: for every abomination to Jehovah, which He hateth, have they done unto their gods; for even their sons and their daughters they have *burnt in the fire* to their gods,' D.xii.31.

Accordingly, we read that the king of Moab in his distress—

'took his eldest son, that should have reigned in his stead, and *offered him for a burnt-offering upon the wall*,' 2K.iii.27;—

and we are told of the people of Sepharvaim that—

'They *burnt their children in the fire* to Adrammelech and Anammelech, the gods of Sepharvaim,' 2K.xvii.31.

356. Again, the fact, that the children were actually *slain* and *burnt*,—and not merely *dedicated* to the idol, as many suppose,—is plainly evidenced by the following passages:—

'Are ye not children of trangression, a seed of falsehood, enflaming yourselves with idols under every green tree, *slaying the children in the valley under the clifts of the rocks*?' Is.lvii.4,5: *comp.* D.xxi.4, 1K.xviii.40, for the *place* of sacrifice.

'Moreover, *thou hast taken thy sons and thy daughters*, whom thou hast borne unto me, and *these hast thou sacrificed unto them to be devoured*. Is this of thy whoredom a small matter, that thou hast *slain my children*, and delivered them to *cause them to pass through* for them?' Ez.xvi.20,21.

'Yea, declare unto them their abominations, that they have committed adultery, and blood is in their hands, and with their idols have they committed adultery, —and have also *caused their sons*, whom they bare unto me, *to pass through* for them *to devour*. . . . For, when they had *slain their children* to their idols, then they came the same day into my Sanctuary to profane it; and lo, thus have they done in the midst of my House.' Ez.xxiii.37,39.

357. Thus we see what is really meant by 'passing through the fire' in other places, *e.g.* where it is said of Ahaz, 2K.xvi.3,—

'He walked in the way of the kings of Israel, yea, and *made his son to pass through the fire*, according to the abominations of the heathen, whom Jehovah cast out from before the children of Israel';

and of Manasseh, 2K.xxi.6,—

'He *made his son to pass through the fire*,' ὡλοκαύτωσε, Jos. *Ant.*IX.xii.1;

and of the people generally, 2K.xvii.17,—

'They *made their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire*';

while we are told also that Josiah—

'defiled the Topheth, which is in the valley of the children of Hinnom, that no man might *make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire to Molech*,' 2K.xxiii.10.

358. The following extract from OORT, *Het Menschenoffer in Israel, p.*114–117, will give the reader some idea of what 'the Topheth' was, and also of what is most probably meant by 'Molech,' which name means literally 'King.'

Topheth is certainly no Proper Name; for it always has the article, Jer.vii.32, xix.6,13,14, 2Ch.xxiii.10: so that in Jer.vii.32, xix.11,12, it should be read הַתֹּפֶת. About its construction we know little, but yet something. By this name was signified not an altar or anything of that kind, but a large *place* at the east end of the Valley of Hinnom. This appears most plainly from Jer.xix, where 'the Topheth' is spoken of as a part of the whole valley, and the prophet threatens that in 'the Topheth' men shall be buried, until there shall be no more room. If anything is said about 'building' the Topheth, the expression may be used with reference to a wall raised about the place where the sacrifices were offered: the same expression is used for the strengthening of towns, *e.g.* 1K.xv.22, [Ps.li.18].

In this Topheth stood various sacrifice-places, *i.e.* (so called) 'high-places,' *viz.* artificial mounds, probably conical in form,—sometimes decked 'with garments of divers colours,' Ez.xvi.16,—usually made of wood, (for they could be *burnt*, 2K.xxiii.15),—and used as altars, Jer.xix.5.* There were also images of men

* This description applies rather to the 'high-places' within the Topheth, than to 'high-places' generally. These seem to have been originally *natural* heights, the summits of which were regarded as sacred, and were perhaps crowned with a stone or a wooden hut or chapel, as is very commonly the case in the East in the present day: *comp.* the common formula, 'high-places of the earth,' D.xxxii.13, Is.lviii.14, Am.iv.13, Mic.i.3, 'high-places of the clouds,' Is.xiv.14, which, as PIERSON observes, *de Heil. Steenen in Israel, p.*66, could hardly have been current, if 'high-place' meant generally only a small mound. Accordingly, we read of Samuel, &c., 'going-up' to the high-place, 1S.ix.13,14,19, of a company of prophets 'coming-down' from it, 1S.x.5, of people feasting there, 1S.ix.12,13. In later times, however, artificial mounds appear to have been raised of smaller dimensions. We read of 'high-places' being *built*, 1K.xi.7, 2K.xvii.9, xxi.3, 2Ch.xxxiii.3, Jer.vii.31, or *made*, 1K.xii.31, 2K.xxiii.15, 2Ch.xxi.11, xxviii.25; they were set-up sometimes upon *hills*, 1K.xi.7, 2Ch.xxi.11, sometimes in towns,

Ez.xvi.17, xxiii.39, probably with the head of a calf: and these, perhaps, had the names of 'Molech' given to them. In any case, there was more than one place of offering. All the accounts testify of 'high-places,' 'abominations,' 'idols'; just as Hosea also speaks of 'calves,' xiii.2, and 'altars as heaps' at Gilgal, xii.11.

In this Topheth the children were first killed, then thrown into the abyss of fire, 'deep and large,' Is.xxx.33, *comp.* Ez.xxiv.9, which was probably made under an image of 'Molech,' so that the children rolled off the hands of this image into the fire,* while music deepened the solemnity. If the children were slain before the

---

1K.xiii.32, 2K.xvii.9, 2Ch.xiv.5, xxviii.25, (unless indeed these passages merely imply that they were built in the neighbourhood of the towns and in close connection with them,) and they were decorated with coloured garments, Ez.xvi.16. Probably, when we read of Josiah 'burning' the high-place at Bethel, 2K.xxiii.15, this may rather refer to burning the *chapel* on the top of it, since in other places we only read of 'breaking-down' the high-places, L.xxvi.30, N.xxxiii.52, 2K.xxiii,8,15, 2Ch.xxxi.1, Ez.vi.3, 'removing' them, 1K.xv.14, xxii.43, 2K.xii.3, xiv.4, xv.4,35, xviii.4,22, 2Ch.xiv.3,5. xv.17, xvii.6, xx.33, xxxii.12, Is.xxxvi.7, 'defiling' them, 2K.xxiii.8,13. The expression, 'house of high-places,' 1K.xii.31, xiii.32, 2K.xvii.29, seems to imply a chapel or temple, in which, or probably in front of which, several of these high-places were erected. And such may have been the kind of place to which Balak is said to have taken Balaam, when he 'brought him up into the high-places of Baal, that thence he might see the utmost part of the people,' N.xxii.41. Only here, it is plain, the 'high-places' were erected on the top of a lofty eminence; and to this famous sanctuary of Moab reference may be made in Is.xvi.12, Jer.xlviii.35. OORT says above that the high-places themselves were used as *altars*; but the altars and high-places are especially distinguished from each other in 2K.xviii.22, xxi.3, 2Ch.xxxi.1, Ez.vi.3,4,6. The passage to which he refers, Jer.xix.5, 'They have built also the high-places of Baal, to burn their sons with fire for burnt-offerings unto Baal,' does not necessarily imply that the children were sacrificed on the top of the mounds in the Topheth. Still, there may have been altars erected on these mounds on which they were slain or their blood was sprinkled. See PIERSON, *de Heil. Steenen in Israel, p.*66,71.

* Rabbi Simeon, in his book *Jalkut*, described the image of Molech as follows, (SELDEN de *Diis Syr.* ii.113.) Molech was a hollow figure, which had seven compartments: the first was opened, when wheaten-meal was offered, the second for pigeons, the third for a sheep, the fourth for a ram, the fifth for a calf, the sixth for a bullock; and, when any one wished to offer his son, then the seventh was opened. The form of the idol was like that of a calf; its hands were opened, and contrived so as to receive into their embrace whatever was presented by the bystanders. While the child was being burnt in the heated statue, they danced and struck cymbals, that its shrieks might not be heard. *Comp.* also Rabbi D. KIMCHI, on 2K.xxiii.10,11, and CICERO *in Verr.*, on the iron bull of Phalaris, in which men were burnt alive. Von der ALM, i.*p.*502. [But the children of the Israelites seem to have been *slain* (350), before being burnt.]

burning, there was, of course, shedding of blood; and, since with every bloody sacrifice of the Israelites, the 'sprinkling of blood' was the principal action, we must naturally conclude that the same was the case also with this offering of the firstborn. Hence is explained the fact that by Jeremiah and Ezekiel there is constant mention made of 'shedding innocent blood,' and Jerusalem is called the 'bloody city,' Ez.xxii.2, xxiv.6,9. What use was made of the blood, appears from Ez.xxiv.7,—'Her blood is in the midst of her; she set it *upon the top of a rock*; she poured it not upon the ground, to cover it with dust.' What else can be meant by the 'blood upon the top of a rock,' but the blood of children, shed upon the holy block of stone in the Topheth? Israel was surely not so demoralised, that when a *murder* was committed out of greed or personal spite, people did not take the trouble to cover it up! Such a state of things could only coexist with a state of utter lawlessness. The children's blood upon the stone (or stones) in the valley of Hinnom was naturally in the eyes of the offerers *sacred*, and therefore they did not cover it: whereas in those of the opponent of child-sacrifice it was 'innocent blood,' which called for vengeance. Perhaps, something of the same kind is indicated also by the obscure words of Is.lvii.6. It is a very natural conjecture that from this is derived the name *Akeldama*='field of blood,' Matt.xxvii.8, Acts i.19, which lies nearly in the position where we should have to look for the old Topheth. That this 'field' was used as a burying-place is then easily explained from the fate which befel the Topheth. Local investigations may probably help to settle this point.

359. It will be observed that Ahaz and Manasseh are stated to have offered each his *son*,—not his *sons*,—and so in the passage last quoted we have 'his *son* or his *daughter*.' These expressions correspond with the following, from which it would seem that only, perhaps, the *first-born child*, that 'openeth the womb,' whether male or female, was thus offered:—

'I polluted them in their own gifts, in *making-to-pass-through all that openeth the womb*, that I might make them desolate, to the end that they might know that I am Jehovah,' Ez.xx.26.

And from the following it would appear that the practice continued even after the beginning of the Captivity, many, perhaps, doing in secret what was no longer openly allowed:—

'Wherefore say unto the House of Israel, Thus saith the Lord God, Are ye polluted after the manner of your fathers, and commit ye whoredom after their abominations? For, when ye offer your gifts, when ye *make your sons to pass through the fire*, ye pollute yourselves with your idols, *even unto this day*: and shall I be enquired of by you, O House of Israel?' Ez.xx.30,31.

*Comp.* also Is.lvii.4,5, quoted above (356), and *v.*9—

'And thou wentest to (the King=) Molech with oil, and didst increase thy (perfumes) incense, and sentest thy messengers far-off, yea, sentest down to Hades.'

[But OORT, *p.*75, considers Is.lvi.9–lvii.10 to be a fragment written *before* the Captivity.]

360. From all the above instances it is sufficiently plain that the Israelites, like the nations round about them, practised habitually—at all events, in the days of the later kings of Judah—the horrid rites of human sacrifice. And, when we also read that Solomon built high places near Jerusalem for 'Chemosh the abomination of Moab,' and 'Molech the abomination of Ammon,' 1K.xi.7, it can scarcely be doubted that he, too, must have at least connived at the usual rites, with which these gods were worshipped, and among which are reckoned, as we have seen in each case, *human sacrifices*, 2K.iii.27, xxiii.10.

361. Nay, in the same place we are told that Solomon built a high-place also for the 'Sidonian Ashtoreth,' and, if so, then he may have honoured also the 'Tyrian Baal,'—more especially as he was so closely connected with Hiram the King of Tyre, 1K.v.1–12, and built his Temple at the very same time when Hiram built his magnificent new Temple to Baal. At all events, in later days, Jezebel did this in *Israel*, 1K.xvi.31–33, Jos. *Ant.*VIII.xiii.1, IX.vi.5, and her daughter, Athaliah, in *Judah*, 2K.viii.18,26,27. (N.B.—Athal*iah* is compounded with *Jah*.) And we know from profane writers that the worship of *this* Baal, the 'Tyrian Hercules,' was horribly polluted with human sacrifices.*

* This appears from EUSEB. *de laud. Constant.* c.13, and from the practice of the Carthaginians, PORPHYR. *de Abst.* ii.*p* 150, SILIUS ITAL. iv.770, and especially from the account of DIODORUS, xx.14, LACT. *Inst.* i.21, as to the transaction in the war with Agathocles, 311–307 B.C. 'The Carthaginians attributed the disasters, which they experienced in this war, to their neglect of the gods, and especially to the circumstance, that they had ceased to send the regular tithes to the Tyrian Hercules, and had presented only gifts of inferior value, as also that their nobles no longer sent their own sons as sacrifices, but purchased strange children, and offered them as their own. To atone for this offence, three hundred Carthaginians, who were guilty of the fault, offered themselves as sacrifices of their own free-will,

362. Moreover, they appear to have performed these bloody sacrifices actually *in the name* of JHVH. For we find several passages where the sacrifice of young children to Molech is spoken of as a profanation of the *Name* of Jehovah.

'Thou shalt not pass-through any of thy seed to Molech, and thou shalt not *profane the Name* of thy Elohim: I am Jehovah.' L.xviii.21.

'I will set my face against that man, and will cut him off from among his people; because he hath given of his seed unto Molech, *to defile my Sanctuary and to profane my Holy Name.*' L.xx.3.

And Zephaniah speaks, i.5, of those in his day—

'who worship and swear to Jehovah and who swear by (Malcham *) their Molech.'

363. Nay, they evidently prided themselves on these acts as acts of devotion, going fresh from the slaughter of their children to worship in the House of JHVH, Ez.xxiii.39,—if they did not even defile the Temple itself with the 'blood of innocents,' Jer.vii.6, xix.4. They appear also to have had some (supposed) *Divine* command, to which they appealed as justifying the practice; since Ezekiel says, as in the Name of Jehovah,—

'I gave them also statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live; and I polluted them in their own gifts, in making to pass-through all that openeth the womb, &c.,' xx.25,26.

And, indeed, we have at least one 'statute' in the Pentateuch itself, which *expressly enjoins human sacrifice!*

'Moreover every *kherem* (devoted-thing), that a man shall devote unto Jehovah out of all which he hath, out of *man* and out of beast, and out of field of his possession, shall not be sold and shall not be redeemed: every *kherem* is holy of holies to Jehovah. Every *kherem*, which shall be devoted out of *man*, shall not be redeemed: it shall *surely be put to death*,' xviii.28,29.*

364. In fact, as OORT justly observes, *p.*37, the very circumstance that Jeremiah repeats so frequently, with reference to child-sacrifice, the formula, 'which I commanded them not,

besides which they sacrificed at one time two hundred boys out of the best families in Carthage.' Von der ALM, i.*p.*505.

* So the inhabitants of a town or country, named its deity *Baalan*, *i.e.* 'our Baal,' 'our Lord.' But the 'Lord' was probably the same in all parts of Canaan, *viz.* JHVH, the 'God of the land,' though worshipped as the 'Baal of Gad,' Jo.xi.17, 'the Baal of Tamar,' Ju.xx.33, &c.: *comp.* 'Our Lady of Loretto,' &c.

neither came it upon my heart,' vii.31,xix.5,xxxii.35, *comp.* D.xvii.3, shows plainly that the people must have pleaded some authority for the practice, emanating (as they declared) from Jehovah himself. He adds, *p.*38—

No one, if speaking of *theft*, &c. would have said, 'Ye shall not *steal*, for *that* I commanded not, saith Jehovah,'—for there was no doubt as to this. Such an expression could only be used with reference to acts which were regarded as religious acts, authorised by Jehovah Himself.

---

* The note of KEIL and DELITZSCH on this text is as follows, *Bibl. Comm.* ii.*p.*169. '*v.*28,29. Consequently, nothing 'devoted,' which any one devotes to the Lord of his property, of men, cattle, and land, shall, as being most holy, be either sold or redeemed. The men 'devoted' are to be killed. According to the literal sense of *v.*28, it is allowed to the individual Israelite to 'devote' not only of his cattle and land, but also of *men* who belonged to him, as *slaves* and *children*. The expression 'devoted-thing' (*kherem*) denoted something which was withdrawn from the use and abuse of men, and given over to God irrevocably and irredeemably, in such a way that the men were killed, but cattle and goods belonged for evermore to the Sanctuary, or else were destroyed for the honour of the Lord. The last *without doubt* was done only in the case of the goods of *idolaters*; at least in D.xiii.13–18 it is only commanded for the condign punishment of idolatrous towns. Hence, however, it follows that the vow to 'devote' could only be made in respect of persons who obstinately resisted that sanctification of the life to which they were bound, and that it was not free for any individual to 'devote' a person at his own will: otherwise the vow of 'devotion' might have been actually misused in the interest of ungodliness to justify a transgression of the Law, that forbad any killing of a man, even of a slave, E.xxi.20. Analogously to this, cattle and land also were only allowed to be 'devoted' by the proprietor in any case where it had been defiled by idolatry or misused for unholy purposes. For the act of 'devotion' was based incontestably upon the idea of the compulsory dedication of something which resisted or impeded consecration; so that in all cases, when the people or the authority carried it out, it bore the character of a theocratic punishment, it was an act of judicial divine sanctity, manifesting itself in justice and judgment.'

But the language of *v.*28 plainly supposes that each individual might make a *kherem* of any of his property,—human-being, beast, or piece of land,—that is, might devote it irrevocably to JHVH,—without the slightest reference to such a case as that described in D.xiii.13–18. And accordingly this is exactly what Jephthah did, Ju.xi.30,31,39,40,

# CHAPTER XXI.

## THE EFFORTS TO REFORM THE WORSHIP OF JEHOVAH IN ISRAEL.

365. We have thus, then, the clearest evidence from the preceding facts, that even in Judah, with all its privileges from the existence of the Temple and the Priesthood, yet during the first eighteen years of Josiah's reign, this *pious* king, with *Hilkiah* as his chief priest and *Jeremiah* as his prophet during the last five years, Jer.i.1, had allowed the worship of Jehovah generally throughout the land to be debased with the grossest idolatry. We may be sure that the same state of things had existed during many previous reigns, with probably some only very partially successful attempts, on the part of Hezekiah and other good kings, to correct these evils,—for which, no doubt, the worship at the high-places gave special opportunities, until Hezekiah appears to have done something to remove them, 2K.xviii.4.

366. Accordingly, we cannot be surprised to be told that similar or still greater abuses prevailed in the kingdom of Israel. We are told, for instance, of the strange nations, whom the Assyrian king planted in Samaria, and how—

'at the beginning of their dwelling there, they feared not Jehovah, . . . they knew not the manner of *the God of the land*,' 2K.xvii.25,26.

'By the king's command, however, one of the priests whom he had carried captive from Samaria, *v.*28,—

'came and dwelt in Bethel, and taught them how they should fear *Jehovah*.'

And then we read, *v.*32–34,41,—

'So they feared Jehovah, and made unto themselves indiscriminately priests of

the high-places, who sacrificed for them in the houses of the high-places. They feared Jehovah and served their own gods, after the manner of the nations who carried them away captive from thence. Unto this day they do after their former manners: they fear not Jehovah, neither do they after their statutes or after their ordinances, &c. So these nations feared Jehovah and served their graven images, both their children and their children's children. *As did their fathers*, so do they unto this day.'

And what 'their fathers did,' to show that they feared the 'God of the land,' appears plainly enough from Hos.xiii.2,—

'They say, Let the sacrificers of human-beings kiss the calves';—

where the proverbial form of this saying shows that the practices in question were habitual.

367. But what did the people of Judah better than this? We must never lose sight of the fact, that we have no account of the doings of the people of Israel *from their own point of view*, but only one written from the point of view which would be taken by a man of Judah, betraying often *political*, as well as religious, animosity. If we had but a genuine history of the northern kingdom from one of themselves, we should probably form a very different estimate of its relations to the sister kingdom; and we should find that some of its kings, compared with many of the kings of Judah, were deserving of respect and even admiration, which are not accorded to them in the story.

368. We have seen, for instance, that Josiah massacred without mercy the priests of the high-places in Israel; while he only 'inhibited' those of Judah from performing sacred offices. Perhaps, his zeal against the former may have been stimulated by the fact that they were not 'sons of Levi,' like the priests of Judah, but taken 'indiscriminately' from any of the tribes, or even from the transplanted heathen themselves: for in Josiah's days the 'Levites,' apparently, were fully recognised as the exclusive ministers of the Temple. Perhaps, he may have been influenced by some consideration for their brethren, or by the intercessions of the latter on their behalf.

369. But the idolatries of the priests of Judah must have been

as great, it would seem, as that of the priests of Israel, and their guilt, surely, from the Mosaic point of view, far greater; since they had defiled their sacred office by the practice of the very same abominations, though with Baal, Astarte, Molech, Chemosh, in place of Nergal and Ashimi, Nibhaz and Tartak, Adrammelech and Anammelech, 2K.xvii.31. Perhaps, therefore, Josiah may have also had in view the desirableness of getting rid altogether of these sacred *persons*, as well as *places*, in Samaria, in order that the religious regards of 'all Israel' might henceforth be centred more thoroughly upon the Temple at Jerusalem, in accordance with the commands of the new-found 'Book of the Law'—that is, the Book of Deuteronomy, D.xii—the finding of which had led to his Reformation.

370. And this Book of Deuteronomy—regarding it, as we must, as the product of Josiah's own age—what a lesson does it teach us as to the idolatrous practices, which were intimately coupled even in those days with the worship of Jehovah in Judah? The reiterated commands—

'Ye shall utterly destroy all the places wherein the nations of Canaan served their gods, upon the high mountains and upon the hills and under every green tree,'* D.xii.2—

'Ye shall overthrow their altars, and break down their pillars, and burn their *asheras* with fire; and ye shall hew down the graven images of their gods and destroy the names of them out of that place,' *v.*3—

give plain testimony as to the writer's consciousness of the existence of these things around him, of which, indeed, the account of Josiah's doings, 2K.xxii, gives such abundant evidence.

371. But still more significant are those passages in Deuteronomy, which imply that human sacrifices were still practised, xviii.9,10, xxii.31, and that a *worshipper of Jehovah* in those days might perhaps think of bringing 'the hire of a whore or the price of a dog (*i.e.* Sodomite) into the *House of Jehovah*'! For

* Thus the Israelites derived their modes of worship from the *Canaanites*, not from the *Egyptians*, who had no 'hills' and not many 'green trees.'

the very fact that such practices are forbidden as 'abomination,' D.xxiii.17,18, implies that the occurrence was conceivable and possible.* So the Deuteronomist forbids the planting 'an Ashera of any kind of wood' (E.V. 'a grove of any trees') near the altar of Jehovah; where 'Ashera' plainly means the obscene symbol already spoken of, and not a 'grove,' because this writer allows no 'altar of Jehovah' except in the Temple, xii.13,14, where no 'grove' could be planted. And so Josiah 'brought out the Ashera from the House of Jehovah,' 2K.xxiii.6.

372. In all this, then, we have very strong evidence to show that the worship of Jehovah began among the Hebrews, and was long continued among them as regards the great mass of the people, in the same low form in which it already existed among the Canaanite tribes; and that it was only gradually purified from its grosser pollutions by the long-continued efforts of those great prophets, whom God raised up for the purpose from time to time in different ages—aided, no doubt, in this work by the sorrowful national calamities which befel them, and probably also in some measure by their coming into contact,

* At the Temple in Jerusalem were particular chambers, in which the women 'wove (houses) tents for the Ashera,' 2K.xxiii.7, and in which they prostituted themselves in honour of the goddess, paying the sums received into the Temple-chest. And at the feasts of Astarte they erected tents and booths upon the high-places, where they gave themselves up to unrestrained sexual intercourse, the women probably receiving pay, which was brought as an offering to the goddess. Von der Alm, *i.p.*513. *Comp.* also L.xix.29, Is.i.10,29, and Bar.vi.43 for the practice at Babylon.

Also in the Syro-Phœnician town of Byblus, those women, who at the festival of Adonis (IAO) did not choose to cut off their hair, were obliged to prostitute themselves for one day to strangers, and give the pay into the Temple-chest. Luc. *de Deâ Syr.* vi, Von der Alm, *i.p.*514.

Selden derives the name Venus from *Benoth*, 'daughters,' which occurs in the Hebrew or Phœnician phrase *Succoth-Benoth*, 'tents of daughters,' made, as we are told, 2K.xvii.30, by the 'men of Babylon' in Samaria—doubtless for impure idolatries. Voss, *de Theol. Gent.* 153, 'readily assents' to this derivation: and it derives some confirmation from the fact of there being a Temple of Venus at *Sicca Venerea* (= Succoth-Benoth), according to Val. Max. i.6, August. *de Civ. Dei*, iv.10,

during the time of the Captivity, with those Divine Truths, which were taught in the Zoroastrian religion.

373. But, with such fearful practices and loathsome abominations, prevailing among their people, even in their most sacred places, 2K.xiv.24, xxiii.7, the language of Isaiah and Jeremiah, breathing the spirit of holy fear, and trust, and love, —of meek piety and patient faith,—of pure self-sacrificing devotion to the cause of truth and righteousness,—presents a most wonderful and amazing contrast, and by that very contrast convinces us, more forcibly than any blind dogma of Scriptural Infallibility could do, that they spoke God's Word to man, and taught Divine Truth as they were 'moved by the Holy Ghost.'

374. It is not necessary, then, to suppose that the Elohist, whoever he may have been, *invented* the Name Jehovah for his people. Only the evidence before us seems to show that, as I have said already, (II.452)—

> whether the word 'Jehovah' be a *corruption of a foreign word*, or originated by some great authority among the Hebrews themselves, it must have been *gradually* brought into popular use.

I conclude that it *is*, most probably, a 'corruption of a foreign word,'—not, as I once suggested (II.466), 'an imitation of some *Egyptian* name of the Deity,' but—a corruption of the Phœnician Name יחוה,—yet, perhaps, not even that—*i.e.* not a *corruption*, but only a dialectic modification of it, by the softening of the ח sound into ה. And I conclude also from the evidence before us that in SAMUEL'S time,—and, if so, then doubtless by his agency,—the first attempt was made to give to this Name—already known and used to some extent among the people, as the name of the 'God of the land' which they had occupied,—that high and holy significance which it afterwards had for the Jews of later days, and now has for us.

375. In short, according to our view, *Samuel* only takes the place of *Moses* in the theory of EWALD. He believes that Moses did not himself *invent* the Name, but found it already in

use exclusively among the members of his mother's family, and commended it in the strongest manner for the use of 'all Israel';—that is, though he did not 'invent' it, yet he was the first to *introduce it into the religious history of Israel.* Our view is that Samuel did not *invent* the Name, but was probably the first to 'introduce it,' with a high and holy meaning, 'into the religious history of Israel.' He found the people—certainly, the northern tribes—already possessed of the name, or of one very similar to it, making use of it in their great Harvest Feast, as the great Name of the greatest Deity. The Divine Spirit had opened his eyes to see more than others of that great Truth, that—

'God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.'

And he desired and laboured to invest this Name,—a Name of high mystery even to the heathen,—whether he simply adopted it without any other than a dialectic change, or slightly modified it for his purpose,—with a special solemnity, and to make it the Name above all others, the Name of Israel's God, the rallying-point for the nation in all their griefs and fears and perplexities.

376. Yet those grand ideas of the nature and character of Jehovah, which the Elohist cherished, and which, we may suppose, with all earnestness he imparted to his disciples, could not at once pervade the whole nation. Nay, even men of higher mind, as might be expected, did not realise them fully at first, or in like measure as the Elohist himself. For the Jehovist in the next age, as we have seen, appears to have had less grand and becoming views of the Divine Being, using frequently very strong anthropomorphisms, and ascribing continually to Jehovah human actions, passions, and affections. Still later writers of the Pentateuch appear to have made the worship of Jehovah to consist chiefly in the punctilious performance of outward forms and ceremonies, lustrations and sacrifices, and the due payment of tithes and firstlings. At last the Deuteronomist breathed a

new life into the dead letter of the Law, and wrote the words of the second covenant, 'the covenant in the land of Moab,' which were to the records of the Tetrateuch, as then existing, what the writings of the New Testament are to those of the Old.

377. But, meanwhile, the *people* generally—what was their condition? If not a word of censure is uttered by the pious writers of the Books of Samuel and Kings upon David or Solomon, Jehoshaphat, Asa, Uzziah, Amaziah, for allowing the 'high-places' to stand throughout the land,* we may be sure that the people generally did just as Ahaz did, 1K.xvi.4—

'sacrificing and burning incense in the high-places, and on the hills, and under every green tree.'

On these high-places they worshipped 'JHVH,' 1K.iii.2; but in their eyes still 'JHVH' was but the Baal of Israel, whom all Israelites were bound to worship as the 'God of the land.'

378. To him, therefore, were offered by the multitude, as sacred things, the rewards of impurity; for him was shed the blood of innocent babes 'among the smooth stones of the valleys, in the clefts of the rocks.' Thus even in Josiah's time Jeremiah could still exclaim, vii.9,10,17,18—

'Will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery, and swear falsely, and burn incense unto Baal, and walk after other gods whom ye know not, and come and stand before me in this House, which is called by My Name, and say, We are delivered to do all these abominations? . . . Seest thou not what they do in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem? The children gather wood, and the fathers kindle the fire, and the women knead their dough, to make cakes to the Queen of Heaven, and to pour out drink-offerings unto other gods, that they may provoke me to anger.'

379. They knew, then, and used the sacred Name, we must believe; but they profaned it, as the people round them did, in their common speech, and by the licentious and cruel practices of their worship. Yet all this while the great Prophets of Judah

* Isaiah nowhere condemns the worship on high-places, nor does Joel, Amos, Nahum, Habakkuk, or Zechariah: Hosea censures them once, x.8, Micah once, i.5. Jeremiah is the first to inveigh severely against them, vii.31, xvii.3, xix.5,xxxii.35.

and Israel, whose souls had been quickened from above with spiritual life, had been striving with their perverse and stolid fellow-countrymen, and labouring to raise their minds to higher views of the Divine Nature, and to nobler conceptions of the meaning of that Name which they were daily profaning. And, if such was the state of things in Jerusalem itself, it is plain what practices must have existed everywhere throughout the cities of Judah and Samaria. The religious notions of the people at large must have been of a very debased and gross character, and their worship utterly confused and disorderly.

380. Just so in Zululand we are now teaching the natives to invest their own name for the Supreme Being, UNKULUNKULU, 'the Great-Great-One,'—corresponding, therefore, in meaning to ELOHIM,—with a higher, more spiritual meaning than they have ever thought of attaching to it. Yet many years—perhaps, centuries—may pass, before the Zulus generally will separate the Name from all the absurd notions and legendary stories, which they may now in their wild heathen state connect with it. We must long expect to find that, while some few of higher mind, or more favoured with opportunities of learning, will embrace that Name, in all the deep significance which Missionaries attach to it, as the Name of their Great Creator, Father, and Friend, 'in Whom they live and move and have their being,' yet the great mass of the people will continue to use it ignorantly and irreverently even as now.

381. So, too, in Northern Europe, for many centuries after Christianity had been preached among the Scandinavian tribes, the orgies of the Feast of Yule must have often contrasted painfully, side by side with the joys of the Christmas Festival. Or, at least, if the latter was more duly observed in towns, where the clergy were at hand to stimulate and guide the devotions of the people, yet in the country districts the Name of CHRIST must have been long profaned, and the new religion desecrated,—as it is now, in fact, by the semi-Christians of

China and New Zealand,—by the admixture with it of heathen rites and most incongruous preachings and practices.

382. In fact, the state of Israel may be compared with that which, in the view of many ardent Protestants, exists even now in some Roman Catholic communities. The people in such cases worship the same God as English Protestants: they call themselves Christians, as servants of the same Lord. Yet there is much in their religion, which not a few English travellers regard as profane and idolatrous, and denounce as gross abominations. The desire, however, of such persons would be, not to teach these (so-called) 'idolaters' to use another name as the name of 'their King,' but to teach them to use the same name worthily. They call them idolaters, not because they bow at the name of Jesus, but because they worship images, adore the Host, and mix up, with the honours due to their one true Lord, the worship of Saints and Virgins innumerable,—which, though, like the Baalim and Ashtaroth of old, supposed to shadow forth under various aspects the glory of the great Life-Giver,* have come at last to be regarded as separate divinities, and stand, as such, between the worshipper and the LORD, the Living God.

* OORT, *de D. der B. in I., p.*41, thinks that Hosea by 'the Baal,' ii.8, xiii.1, refers to the worship of the 'Tyrian Baal,' introduced by Jezebel, of which some remains were still existing in his time in Israel. But surely this had been rooted out by Jehu, 2K.x.18-28. And 'the Baal,' here and elsewhere, as Jer.ii.8, vii.9, xi.13,17, xii.16, xix.5, xxiii.13,27, xxxii.29,35, Zeph.i.4, refers rather to JHVH, the Syro-Phœnician Baal,—(*comp.* Hos.ii.16, where Israel is described as saying of Jehovah 'my Baal')—of whom the various Baalim were only representatives, as the various 'Our Ladies' in different parts of the world, all represent 'the Virgin.'

# CHAPTER XXII.

## CONCLUDING REMARKS.

383. We have thus completed a thorough examination of the Book of Genesis; and we have now before us the above results, based upon unquestionable facts. Other critics may differ as to some of the details: they may not approve all the conclusions, which have appeared to follow with good reason from the existence of these facts: they may not agree with me as to the precise ages, in which the different parts of Genesis were most probably written: they may not interpret, exactly as I have, the 'signs of time' which have been detected. I believe that the inferences which I have drawn, as to the ages of the different writers, from the indications before us, are just and sound, and, at all events, tenable and probable. But I lay no stress on this particular point, as to the chronological order of the different documents, or portions of documents, of which the Book of Genesis is composed. The two main conclusions for which I contend,—and which I believe have been here so plainly established, that they will scarcely be denied,—are the facts of the *non-Mosaic authorship* of Genesis, and the *unhistorical character* of a great portion of its contents.

384. I assume it, then, to be certain that the Book of Genesis is a composite narrative, the work of several different authors, who lived in different ages and under different circumstances, removed, all of them, considerably from the time of the Exodus It is certain also that many portions of this narrative—as the

accounts of the Creation, the Fall, the Deluge, the separate origin of the tribes of Israel from those of Canaan, &c.—stand in direct contradiction to well-known facts of Science, and cannot therefore be regarded as historically true. But we have seen disclosed the mode in which the whole story has been composed, by the successive insertions of separate portions, written at different times from very different points of view, and often, as we have noted, distinctly at variance with each other. This being the case, it is impossible to place implicit confidence in *any* of these records, on whatever traditions they may have been based, as conveying to us in all their details unquestionable facts of veracious history; for we have not here the personal testimony of eyewitnesses to the reality of facts, which, on grounds internal or external, are in themselves inherently incredible. Still less can we receive these statements, as secured from all possibility of error, as being divinely, infallibly, true.

385. And, what is true of Genesis, is true, as we have seen, of the rest of the Pentateuch. Deuteronomy was written at a very late age, by the same writer who has composed more than half of the Book of Joshua, and who is shown by this alone to have lived long after the death of Moses, and who, in point of fact, lived in the days of the later kings. And we have traced, as we believe, the hand of the Deuteronomist making insertions also in Genesis, as we may trace it hereafter in the other Books of the Pentateuch. But, however this may be, certain it is that the section of most importance in the whole story of the Exodus, that about which, as a centre, that story, as it were, revolves,—I mean, E.vi.2–7, which contains the account of the revelation of the name 'Jehovah' to Moses,—is due to the very same author, who wrote the first accounts of the Creation and the Deluge, the Elohistic writer of Genesis, who cannot have lived *before* the time of Samuel.

386. Hence we may infer that Exodus, Leviticus, and Num-

bers must also be mainly the products of a later age than that of Moses, though (as far as we see at present) they may yet be found to contain some portions of Mosaic matter, or at least some notices of Mosaic institutions. But even these last must be limited in extent, if it be true, as we have seen reason to believe, that the name 'Jehovah' itself is a name of later introduction into the religious worship of Israel, and that there are no trustworthy signs of any Levitical priesthood having existed in Israel before the days of David and Solomon,—rather, that there are very plain indications of the contrary.

387. Yet, for all this, the very existence of such a narrative as that of the Elohist is, as we have argued, a very strong proof that it was based on real traditions, as to some former great event in the nation's history. Bishop BROWNE, indeed, says, *p.*78:

> Everything, then, tends to prove that the history of the Pentateuch must be *in its main facts* true. The people without question *came out of Egypt, sojourned in the wilderness, conquered Canaan,* and must have been both *numerous and well-trained,* or such a conquest would have been impossible. This is exactly what the Pentateuch says, and *what Bishop* COLENSO *denies*!

To the assertion, which closes the above paragraph, I can only give a direct and emphatic contradiction: nor can I understand how Bishop BROWNE, as a Christian controversialist, could have allowed himself to make such a statement.

388. Except as regards the *multitude* of the Israelites,—and then only as regards the *vast numbers* given in the Pentateuch, which Deans MILMAN and STANLEY, Dr. VAUGHAN, and a number of other devout commentators, have also supposed to be excessive,—I have *not* denied any single one of the points, which Bishop BROWNE has quoted above, as summarising the 'main facts of the history of the Pentateuch.' Rather, I have distinctly assumed the fundamental truth of each of them, in the following words of a passage, to which Bishop BROWNE himself refers, *p.*68:—

> There may have been, as we have said, . . . many legendary stories of their

ancestors, and of former *great events in their history*—how they once *fled in a large body out of Egypt*, under an eminent leader, such as Moses,—how they *had been led through that great and terrible wilderness*, had encamped under the dreadful Mount, . . . how they had lost themselves in the dreary waste, and struggled on through great sufferings, and many died, but the rest *fought their way at last into the land of Canaan, and made good their footing* among the tribes which they found there. II.485.

Further, after stating that the present narrative must have been written after the age of Moses, I added as follows:—

But this statement does not amount to a denial that *the Israelites did leave Egypt, and remain for a time in the wilderness of Sinai*, under circumstances which produced a profound impression on the national mind. And, indeed, it is *most reasonable* to believe that some great event in the ancient history of the Hebrew people, of which a traditionary recollection was retained among them, may have given to the Elohist the idea of his work, and been made by him the basis of his story. II.223.

389. I was arguing then merely from the facts which we had had already before us, in spite of the contradictions observed in the narrative: but, of course, I did not assume *à priori* the traditionary view, that the story *must* be received as infallibly true. But afterwards I wrote thus, still more emphatically:—

There is not, as has been said repeatedly already, the *slightest reason to believe* that the whole story is a pure fiction—that there was no residence of the Israelites in Egypt, no deliverance out of it. Upon consideration of the whole question, it is impossible not to feel that some real movement out of Egypt in former days *must* lie at the basis of the Elohistic story. It is *almost inconceivable* that such a narrative should have been written, without some real tradition giving the hint for it. What motive, for instance, could the writer have had, for taking his people down into Egypt, representing them as miserable slaves there, and bringing them out of Egypt into Canaan, unless he derived it from legendary recollections of some former residence of the Hebrews in Egypt under painful circumstances, and of some great deliverance? II.514.

Was Bishop BROWNE, then, justified in saying that I 'deny' that, which I have above distinctly maintained?

390. And, again, was it just in him to speak, *p.*80, of my 'hostility to the Pentateuch,'—of my 'attacking the whole fortress,'—when he ought to have spoken of my 'hostility to *his own particular view of* the Pentateuch'? It is true that I have proved (as I conceive) that the Pentateuchal story is the

composite work of various authors in different ages, and that it is not historically true, if regarded as relating the actual events of that time—the time of the Exodus—which it professes to describe. But, though in *this* sense 'unhistorical,' in another sense it is of the highest historical value. For the critical study of it throws light upon many obscure points of the later history of Israel, and is especially instructive in exhibiting the ideas and practices which prevailed in the different times in which its different parts were composed.

391. The beggarly condition of the Levites in the early days of David, as revealed in G.xlix.5–7,—the claims advanced on their behalf in a later day, for a liberal maintenance, as shown in the laws of Leviticus and Numbers,—their increased influence, but diminished income, in Josiah's time, as implied in the Book of Deuteronomy,—the elaborate ritualistic directory which may perhaps have been copied from that of the Tyrian worship, and may represent the system which was *meant* to be enforced —but never actually was enforced—in the Temple of Solomon, —the minute specifications for the building of the Tabernacle, which read almost as if they were actually taken from the 'working-drawings' of the Temple itself, by some one who was personally concerned in its erection, and may perhaps give us some idea of the gorgeous Temple, which Hiram built for the 'Tyrian Hercules,' and which Solomon is believed to have imitated,—the injunction which *commands* human sacrifices, L.xxvii.28,29, and the narrative in G.xxii, which, while not condemning—rather approving—yet seems intended to discourage them,—all these, and a multitude of other similar notices, require only to be freed from the restraints of conventional, traditionary, interpretations, and they will at once become instinct with life and meaning. In short, the whole Pentateuch, to the critical eye, is pregnant with history: and the driest details of the Levitical Law may yield some fact of interest and importance, to illustrate the course of religious development in Israel.

392. Thus I reverence with all my heart the Pentateuch as containing some of the most ancient—if not *the most ancient* *—writings in the world, though it contains also some of much later date,—as conveying to us directly, or by reasonable inference, a knowledge of some of the earliest facts in human history, of which we have any authentic information, —above all, as recording apparently the first movements of higher Divine Life in the hearts of men of the Israelitish race, from which our own religious life has been to a great extent derived—the kindling of that spiritual flame, which in Israel's worst days was never suffered to be quite extinguished, but, fed from time to time with fresh supplies from the Eternal Source, beamed out at length upon the nations, bright and clear, in the full glory of the Teaching of CHRIST.

393. *Securus judicat Orbis Terrarum!* Good men and true of all countries and classes,—the most devout and earnest in all ages,—have found in the Bible rich supplies of spiritual food,—'manna' for their daily journey in the wilderness,—'wine that gladdens,' and 'bread which strengthens,' man's heart, and 'oil that makes his face to shine,' with a bright hope and a cheerful content, in the midst of all life's troubles and difficulties. This common witness of the human mind in its best estate is a stronger evidence of the real Divine worth of

* This explains at once the existence of 'archaic words and idioms in at least the first four Books of the Pentateuch,' to which Bishop BROWNE refers, *p.*78, as an evidence of their great antiquity. They contain, as I have said, perhaps, the *most ancient* writings that exist in the world—but of the age of Samuel, David, and Solomon, not of Moses.

Bishop BROWNE has given one specimen of the existence of *archaic* words in *Deuteronomy*: he says, 'עָר, the ancient form of the common word עִיר, 'a city,' occurs in D.ii.9. It occurs in *later* Books only as a Proper Name, as 'Ar-Moab,' Is.xv.1.' But in D.ii.9 this very place 'Ar-Moab' is meant, so that our Eng. Vers. actually reads 'Distress not the Moabites . . . for I have given Ar unto the children of Lot for a possession.' Thus *this* expression, at all events, is no proof whatever of the existence of archaic forms in Deuteronomy.

the Scriptures, than any mere dogma or miraculous attestation could be. In this sense we may say, *Vox populi, Vox Dei. It is true,* for the universal conscience of mankind bears overwhelming testimony to it, that 'the Bible contains God's Word' —that it reveals the Mind and Will of God to Man.

394. But, when we say 'the Bible contains God's Word,' we do not mean, as some have supposed, that we may 'pick and choose' among the contents of the Bible,—that we can separate the books or portions of the Bible, which *are* God's Word, from the books or portions which *are not.* We mean that throughout the Bible the Word of God will be heard by the listening ear and the obedient heart, reproving, exhorting, instructing, comforting,—but that this Word is 'the spirit and the life,' which breathes in the written words—not the mere 'flesh,' or letter, of them. And, as we read the sacred text, we can feed by faith upon this Bread of Life, and feel our strength renewed, and the daily waste supplied of our spiritual substance, while yet our spirits have no power to assimilate the mere human elements, which are of the earth earthy, which must pass away, having no fitness in themselves to sustain the life of our souls.

395. Thus we need not be disquieted, though the progress of criticism should take from us much in the Scriptures, which perhaps, without sufficient reason, we had hitherto regarded as infallibly certain and true,—should show that the Scripture-writers were left to themselves, as men, in respect of all questions of Science and History,—that we must seek the proofs of their Inspiration not in any such matters as these, but in those words of Eternal Life, which come to us with a power that is not of this world, and find us out in our inner being, with messages from God to the soul. And how comforting it is to know that all words of this kind, which God our Father has spoken to us, 'at sundry times, and in divers manners,'—whether by prophets and apostles, or by the lips of JESUS CHRIST Himself—stand firm and sure as God Himself is—as our own being is a

reality—as our own moral consciousness, to which those living words appeal, is a sign that we are made in God's Image. They are all 'pure meat,'—spiritual food, on which our souls may daily feed,—portions of Living Bread, which we are meant to be supplying continually, one to another, as the heart of each is quickened with that Eternal Word, which is the Light and Life of Men.*

* ORIGEN's words are very striking, in explaining the meaning of the expression 'eating the flesh and drinking the blood' of Christ. *Hom.vii. in Lev.* (*Migne*, xii.*p.*487).

'*With the Flesh and with the Blood of His Word*, as with pure meat and drink He supplies with drink and refreshes the whole race of men. Our Lord and Saviour says, 'Unless ye shall have eaten My Flesh and drunk My Blood, ye will have no life in yourselves. My Flesh truly is meat, and My Blood truly is drink.' Because, then, Jesus is wholly and entirely pure, all His Flesh is meat, and all His Blood is drink; since every work of His is holy, and every word of His is true. Hence it is that both His Flesh is true meat and His Blood is true drink.

'He, who knows not how to hear, may perhaps twist aside, and turn away his hearing, like those who said, 'How will this Man give us His Flesh to eat? Who can hear Him? And they departed from Him.' But ye, if ye are sons of the Church, if ye are imbued with the mysteries of the Gospel, if the Word made Flesh dwells in you, acknowledge that the things which we say are the Lord's, lest, perchance, he who ignores may be ignored. Acknowledge that these things are figures, which are written in the Divine Volumes, and so, as spiritual, and not as carnal, examine and understand what is said. For if as carnal ye receive these words, they hurt you and do not nourish. For in the Gospels, too, there is the letter which kills: not in the Old Testament only is the killing letter found. For if thou followest according to the letter this very thing which is said, 'Unless ye shall have eaten My Flesh and drunk My Blood,' this letter kills.

'In the second place, in this matter, after *His* flesh, *Peter and Paul and all the Apostles are pure meat.*

'In the third place, *their disciples*; and thus *every one*, in proportion to his excellencies or the purity of his sentiments, *is made pure meat to his neighbour.*'

The same passage of S. JOHN is explained by EUSEBIUS, as follows, *De Eccl. Theol.*III.xii, (*Migne*,xxiv.*p.*1022,1023):—

'Whereby He instructed them to hear spiritually the words spoken about His Flesh and Blood: 'for do not think (said He) that I am speaking of the flesh, with which I am clothed, that it is necessary to eat it, or suppose that I order you to drink My sensible and corporeal blood. But know this that my words, which I have spoken to you, they are spirit and they are life.' Thus *these same words and discourses of His are* '*the Flesh and the Blood*,' of which he who partakes, nourished continually as though with Heavenly Bread, shall partake of Heavenly Life.'

396. And this is how we reply to the fallacy involved in the argument of Bishop BROWNE on *p.*5 :—

> It is surely wiser and more practical to look first for the truth of what exists and prevails, and not to be picking holes in it, and trying to find fallacies in it, *before you have ground enough to think that such fallacies exist . . . Find out what is true in the faith of your fathers*, before setting to work to find out its falsehood.

This is exactly what I hope in my measure to have done. From the very first I have stated, what I repeat now, that this '*is* true in the faith of our fathers'—that God's Word is to be heard in the Bible—that he that wills may hear it, if he brings only to the study of it a childlike, loving, prayerful, and obedient heart. But I have pointed out a great 'fallacy' in the faith of multitudes,—one which Bishop BROWNE and other well-meaning men have done their part to foster, but one which, I verily believe, is 'sowing broadcast throughout the land the seeds of doubt and infidelity,' from which (unless through God's mercy

And so TERTULLIAN, *De Resurr. Carnis*, xxxvii, (*Migne*, ii.*p.*847):—

'And therefore pronouncing His Word life-giving, because His Word was spirit and life, He called it, too, His Flesh, because His Word also was made Flesh,—forsooth, to be desired for the sake of life, and to be devoured by hearing, and to be chewed-over by the mind, and digested by faith.'

And CLEMENS ALEX. *Pæd.* I.vi, (*Migne*, viii.*p.*296):—

'In another place also the Lord, in the Gospel according to John, expressed it differently by a comparison, saying, 'Eat ye My Flesh and drink ye My Blood,' manifestly referring allegorically to the beverage of faith and of the Gospel.'

And IGNATIUS, *Ep. ad Philadelph.* (*Migne*, v. *p.*828), has προσφυγὼν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ ὡς σαρκὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 'flying for refuge to the *Gospel* as to the *Flesh* of Jesus Christ.'

And so, again, JEROME *in Ps.*cxlvii, (*Migne*, xxvi.*p.*1258,1259):—

'I understand by *the Body of Jesus* the *Gospel*, the *Holy Scriptures*, His *doctrine*. And when He says, 'He who shall not have eaten My Flesh and drunk My Blood,' Joh.vi,—although the words may be understood in a mystery,—yet, more truly, *the Body of Christ and His Blood* is *the Word of the Scriptures*, is *Divine Doctrine*. . . . If ever we hear the Word of God, and so the Word of God, and the Flesh of Christ, and His Blood, is poured into our ears, and we are thinking of something else, into how great danger do we run! . . . Thus, also, in respect of the Flesh of Christ, which is the Word of Doctrine, that is to say, the Interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, according to our willingness, so do we receive food: if thou art holy, thou findest refreshment: if thou art a sinner, thou findest pain!'

counteracted by the spread of sounder principles) a direful crop may be expected to spring up in the next generation.

397. That fallacy, of which I speak, is the notion that, because Divine Truth is contained in the Scriptures, every statement in the Bible—scientific or historical—must be regarded as infallibly true.* Bishop BROWNE, I believe, does not himself hold this extreme view, but he helps to foster it, as I have said, in others, when he writes such a passage as this, *p.*81 :—

> Without overlooking the difficulties which Modern Science has raised, we still may say, that far more formidable problems occur in life and in religion, than the apparent inconsistency of the first Chapter of Genesis with the now generally acknowledged antiquity of the Universe,—than that of the genealogies with the discovery (should it turn out to be one) that man has been in this earth more than 6,000 years,—or than the appearance of the volcanic hills of Auvergne and Languedoc, as contrasted with the account that the Flood covered the tops of the mountains.

I answer that there is no analogy whatever between the things compared,—on the one hand, moral and religious difficulties, which perplex us in life,—on the other hand, statements in the Bible, which are flatly contradicted by scientific facts, and which yet are believed to be divinely and infallibly true.

398. The Bishop, however, argues as follows, *p.*6 :

> You know that your religion is of God: and if so, most probably, some of it

---

* Thus, for instance, Canon MCNEILE is reported in the *Record* of May 8, 1865, to have spoken in Exeter Hall as follows:—

'The verbal Inspiration of the Old Testament and the *honesty* and *veracity* of our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ must stand or fall together. . . . It is very true, as has often been remarked, that there is a human element in the Old Testament. So there is. . . . There are diversities of feelings, geniuses, temperaments, all varying with the different authors. . . . We do not say that every part is equally important: but we do say that every part is equally—because perfectly—true. . . . The one is as infallibly true as the other. . . . We must either receive the Verbal Inspiration of the O.T., or deny the *veracity*, the *honesty*, the *integrity*, of our Lord Jesus Christ as a Teacher of Divine Truth. . . . I maintain that this is what our Church of England holds, and that every unprejudiced reader of her teachings and her formularies will come to the same decision, provided he has no object to attain by making out some other decision.'

may not be quite clear to Man. It is above you in its origin, in its principles, in its end. Why should you expect all its details to be down close to your eyes and your understanding? . . . If the very subject makes it likely that there will be difficulties, the mode of delivery, the way in which it all comes down to us, makes it also likely that there will occur parts and passages which may be puzzling, and in which the puzzles may be even inexplicable.

But the 'parts and passages' of the Bible, with which we have here had to do, are not 'puzzling' at all, except on the fallacious theory of their infallible accuracy. Once allow that in all matters of this kind the Bible must give account of itself —of its contents, its age, its origin—just like any other book; and the mind will no more be harassed—nay, anguished—with these innumerable and inexplicable 'puzzles.' But what a fearful responsibility do those take upon themselves, who in an age like this of earnest enquiry and progress, not only do nothing themselves to remove these dangerous fallacies, but by half-uttered insinuations encourage—if they do not actually by plain outspoken words lead on—the unreasoning multitude, to deride the honest endeavour to reconcile Religious Truth with the certain results of Science, as the work of 'minute and clever criticism,' near akin to the folly of atheism!

399. For these are some of Bishop BROWNE's words, *p.*7:—

Who would think of reading nature *only* through a microscope? The eye that was so cramped would be quick to find flaws in the emerald and dust on the wings of a butterfly; but it could not look out on all the fair proportions of the universe, nor see the harmony of God's creations round it. The lens of microscopic criticism is useful in its place of duty, but blinding rather than enlightening, when it is the chief avenue by which light can find its way to the eye . . . There is great fascination in minute and clever criticism. He who indulges in it sees his own acuteness and is pleased with it. Like the disputings of a subtle logician, it is more apparent, more imposing, than wide thought and deep reflection. And the age we live in is one that worships cleverness, but sets little store by wisdom. Cleverness brings its stock to the market at once; whereas wisdom may think long before letting its voice be heard in the streets; and, when at last it cries aloud, most likely no man regardeth it.

400. But who desires to look at the Bible '*only* through a microscope,' or to make 'the lens of microscopic criticism the

*chief* avenue,' by which the light of Truth is to find its way to the eye? The microscope will detect no 'flaws' in the perfect works of *God*, and may therefore be applied to them without fear: it does not find *dust* on the butterfly's wings, but finds the apparent dust to be beautiful feathers. Whereas in *man's* workmanship, it does detect roughness, and defect, and other signs of human imperfection. Nor will it detect 'flaws' or 'imperfections' in the Infallible, Eternal, Word of God. Rather, the 'lens of microscopic criticism' has never been applied to search into the moral and spiritual Truth contained in the Bible,—how absurd, or else how misleading, to reason as if it could be!—but merely to examine the human element, the earthly framework, of the Scriptures; and, in being used to prove *its* imperfection, it may be the means of delivering some from an idolatrous worship of the mere letter of the Bible, others (and how many in this day!) from rejecting altogether the Divine Teaching of God's Word in the Bible, on account of its supposed identity with what is *manifestly false*.

401. But Bishop BROWNE places the pyramid upon its point by arguing from our Lord's human knowledge to prove the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. He makes, indeed, large admissions on this subject, *p.*12,13:—

> If our Lord was perfect man, it is quite clear that a human mind has a capacity for a certain amount of knowledge, but not for infinite knowledge. Our Lord's human mind therefore could have possessed only a certain amount of knowledge; the absence of knowledge is ignorance; therefore partial knowledge in any intelligent being implies also partial ignorance; and therefore again *our Lord, as Man, must have been partially ignorant.*

Thus far, then, Bishop BROWNE admits the identical proposition which I have myself maintained. He condemns me, not because I have said that our Lord, as Man, shared the ignorance of those whom He called His brethren, but because I have said that He, perhaps, was ignorant in respect of one particular point, and may have shared in the *mistakes* of the age in which he lived,

not only as regards other matters of Science, but expressly as regards the authorship of the Pentateuch. But he proceeds as follows, *p.*13 :—

But ignorance does not of necessity involve error . . . And there is not one word in the Bible which would lead us to suppose that our Blessed Lord was liable to error, *in any sense of the word, or in any department of knowledge.* I do not say that we have any distinct statements to the contrary. But *there is nothing like a hint* that there was such a liability; whereas His other human infirmities, —weakness, weariness, sorrow, fear, suffering, temptation, ignorance,—all these are put forward prominently, and many of them frequently.

402. We are told that 'in *all* things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren,' Heb.ii.17,—that 'He was in *all* points tried like as we are, yet without sin,' Heb.iv.15. Is there *sin* in a *mistake*? When a savage mistakes a string of beads for articles of value, or a civilised Englishman mistakes mere paste for diamond, is there any *sin* in this? Could Jesus have been indeed human—could He have been 'perfect man,' 'made in all things like to His brethren,' 'tried in all points like as we are,'—without being tried in this way also,—as, for instance, by mistaking the appearances of distant objects from the imperfection of His human vision? Nay, it is plain that He did make such a mistake, according to the narrative in Mark xi.12, which I quote in answer to Bishop BROWNE'S statement, that there is 'nothing like a *hint*' in the Bible of His sharing with us such 'human infirmities' as these:

'And on the morrow, when they were come from Bethany, He was hungry. And, seeing a fig-tree afar off having leaves, He came if haply He might find anything thereon. And, when He came to it, He found nothing but leaves; for the time of figs was not. And Jesus answered and said unto it, No man eat fruit of thee hereafter for ever!'

Here, evidently, it is implied that Jesus was 'mistaken' in expecting to find fruit on this tree, in supposing that the time of figs was already come. For violence must be done to the plain meaning of the Scripture text to make it express another sense than this.

403. But, if even He might be in error on *some* points, Bishop

BROWNE says, yet He could not have been left in error on such a subject as that of the authorship of the Pentateuch:—

> Whether in things merely human it was possible that our Lord in His Humanity should have erred or not, surely, with such a mission as His, even if we lay aside the truth of His Divinity, we can never suppose that He would have been suffered to err in those things, which concerned the dealings of God with man. . . . It seems unquestionable that our Lord continually speaks of Moses as a great Lawgiver, as a great Prophet,—that He continually endorses his laws, at least his moral laws,—that he quotes the Pentateuch as written by Moses,—that He tells us that Moses wrote of Him. If, therefore, our Divine Lord, He through whom most, and most signally, God has spoken to man, was not in error about a most important *religious* truth, there was such a man as Moses, there were such laws as the laws of Moses, there was such a Prophet as Moses, and there remained writings of Moses.* *p.*12–15.

404. I reply, first, that I have never denied that 'there was such a man as Moses, &c.' On the contrary, I have assumed it throughout as most probable, if not certain, that there was an Exodus of the people of Israel from Egypt, under some such a Leader or Prophet as Moses, and as possible, that he may have given them laws and written documents, of which portions may still be contained in the Pentateuch. In maintaining also that Samuel, most probably, was the writer of the Elohistic story, I have carried up the origin of this account of the Exodus to within a century or two of Moses himself, taking account of the fact, allowed by most scholars, that the time of the Judges was probably very much shorter than is generally supposed. I have thus made it appear the more probable that some real remains of the Mosaic laws or institutions may be retained in some part of the Pentateuch. But this is a very different thing from

* Precisely the same argument, as we have seen, note, *p.*314, is used by Dr. MCNEILE to prove that every scientific or historical statement of the Bible is infallibly true. If we deny this, he says, we also 'deny the veracity, the honesty, the integrity, of our Lord Jesus Christ, as a Teacher of Divine Truth.' From this proposition, however, Bishop BROWNE altogether dissents, since he says, *Aids to Faith*, *p.*317, 318,—'It is a *secondary* consideration, and a question on which we may safely agree to differ, whether or not every Book of the O.T. was written so completely under the dictation of God's Holy Spirit, that every word, not only doctrinal, but also *historical* or *scientific*, must be infallibly correct and true.'

saying that Moses wrote the whole or the main portion of the Pentateuch. I have proved, as I believe, that he certainly did not,—that the Pentateuch, as a whole, is the work of a later age,—that especially the Book of Deuteronomy was written as late as the age of Josiah.

405. But the argument of Bishop BROWNE is obviously based upon a mere fallacy. He says, *p.*18—

> Christ was so great a Prophet, (let alone the question of His Deity), and a Prophet sent for so high a purpose, that we cannot believe Him to have been in error as to that *which concerned the truth and the groundwork of the religion which was before Him.*

But what do we know about this? How do we know whether it was so 'important,' in a religious point of view, that our Lord should not be left to share the ordinary views of His countrymen about the authorship and historical value of the Pentateuch? It may seem to us 'important': but what does that prove? As Bishop BROWNE says, *p.*6:—

> We know that our religion is of God, and if so, most probably, some of it may not be quite clear to man.

406. Thus it may seem strange to us, that so very many of the Christian world should have been left for centuries resting their religious hopes upon a baseless dogma,—still more so, that Saints and Apostles, Prophets and Priests, and even the Son of Man Himself, should have been allowed to share on these points the current opinions of their time, though they did *not* make them the basis of their faith and hope, as some in our own days have done.

But, if the facts are found to be so, our duty is to acquiesce in them, as being such by Divine permission, and to conclude that our poor human wisdom is mistaken in assuming it to be 'important,' that correct knowledge on matters such as these should have been revealed supernaturally even to the Christ Himself. Our duty is to receive the *facts*, as they really are,—without trying to evade, to hide, or to pervert them,—

and with the Apostle of old, in view of a fact, alike inexplicable by human methods of reasoning, to bow our heads before the Supreme Goodness and say—

'O the depth of the riches both of the Wisdom and Knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!' Rom.xi.33.

407. *Securus judicat Orbis Terrarum!* Again I say, the fact that the true and faithful of all lands, of all ages, have found unspeakable solace and delight in the study of the Scriptures, such as no other book has ever supplied,—have drunk from it, day by day, as from the brook by the wayside, the living stream which has refreshed their souls, when travelling hot and weary through this land of their pilgrimage,—this witness of the Church to the value of the Bible is a surer evidence of its Divine original, of its Divine appointment to fill a wonderful part in the education of mankind, than any decree of Synod or Council, or any miraculous proof could be.

408. But so, too, that intense longing, which pervades so many earnest hearts in this our day—in all countries, and in all classes—to find a way for ourselves and others out of the narrow dogmatic systems, in which in our different churches we have all been more or less trained, into that Christianity of which Dean MILMAN speaks, *History of the Jews*, *p.*xxxiv—

comprehensive, all-embracing, Catholick, which knows what is essential to Religion, what is temporary and extraneous to it—

that so we may breathe a freer air, and enjoy a clearer light, and have—

Free space for every human doubt,
That the whole mind may orb about—

is to my own mind a certain proof that the Divine Educator Himself is here, and the Spirit of God moving even now upon the face of the waters.

# CRITICAL ANALYSIS

OF

# THE BOOK OF GENESIS.

# SYNOPTICAL TABLE

OF THE RESULTS OF

# THE CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF GENESIS.

| Chaps. | E | $E_2$ | J | $J_2$ | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I. | 1–31 | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| II. | 1–4$^a$ | .. | 4$^b$–25 | .. | .. |
| III. | .. | .. | 1–24 | .. | .. |
| IV. | .. | .. | 1–26 | .. | .. |
| V. | 1–28,30–32 | .. | 29 | .. | .. |
| VI. | 9–14,17–22 | .. | 1–3,5–8,15,16 | .. | 4 |
| VII. | 6–9,11,13–16$^a$,18$^a$,19$^b$,21,22,23$^b$,24 | .. | 1–5,10,12,16$^b$,17,18$^b$,19$^a$,20,23$^a$ | .. | .. |
| VIII. | 1,2$^a$,3$^b$,4$^b$,5,13$^a$,14–19 | .. | 2$^b$,3$^a$,4$^{ac}$,6–12,13$^b$,20–22 | .. | .. |
| IX. | 1–17,28,29 | .. | 18–27 | .. | .. |
| X. | .. | .. | 1–7,18–32 | .. | 8–12 |
| XI. | 10–27,31,32 | .. | 1–9,28–30 | .. | .. |
| XII. | 4$^b$,5 | .. | 1–4$^a$,6–20 | .. | .. |
| XIII. | 6,12$^a$ | .. | 1–5,7–11,12$^b$–18 | .. | .. |
| XIV. | .. | .. | .. | 1–24 | .. |
| XV. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 1–21 |
| XVI. | 1,3,15,16 | .. | 2,4–14 | .. | .. |
| XVII. | 1–27 | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| XVIII. | .. | .. | 1–17,20–33 | .. | 18,19 |
| XIX. | 29 | .. | 1–28,30–38 | .. | .. |
| XX. | .. | 1–17 | 18 | .. | .. |
| XXI. | 2–5 | 8–20,22–27$^a$,32 | 1,6,7,21,27$^b$–31,33,34 | .. | .. |
| XXII. | .. | .. | 1–13,19–24 | .. | 14–18 |
| XXIII. | 1–20 | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| XXIV. | .. | .. | 1–58,61–67 | .. | 59,60 |
| XXV. | 7–11$^a$,12–17,19,20,21$^b$,24–26 | .. | 1–6,11$^b$,18,21$^a$,22,23,27–34 | .. | .. |
| XXVI. | 34,35 | 18 | 1–3,6–17,19–33 | .. | 4,5 |
| XXVII. | .. | .. | 1–46 | .. | .. |

N.B. Of the 1533 verses of Genesis, E (according to the above) contains 336,—$E_2$, 106,—J, 1028,—$J_2$, 24,—D, 39; so that E has about *two ninths* of Genesis, and J *thrice* as much, or *two thirds* of Genesis.

# SYNOPTICAL TABLE

OF THE RESULTS OF

# THE CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF GENESIS.

| Chaps. | E | $E_2$ | J | $J_2$ | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| XXVIII. | 1-9 .. .. .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | 10-22 .. .. .. .. .. | .. | .. |
| XXIX. | 24,29,32$^{ab}$,33$^{ad}$,34$^{a}$,35$^{ad}$ .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | 1-23,25-28,30,31,32$^{cd}$,33$^{bc}$,34$^{bcd}$,35$^{bc}$ | .. | .. |
| XXX. | 1$^{a}$,4$^{a}$,5,6$^{a}$,7,8$^{ac}$,9-13,17,18$^{ac}$,19,20$^{ac}$,21-24$^{a}$ | .. .. .. .. .. | 1$^{b}$,2,3,4$^{b}$,6$^{b}$,8$^{b}$,14-16,18$^{b}$,20$^{b}$,24$^{b}$-43 | .. | .. |
| XXXI. | 18 .. .. .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | 1-17,19-55 .. .. .. .. | .. | .. |
| XXXII. | .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | 1-32 .. .. .. .. .. | .. | .. |
| XXXIII. | .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | 1-20 .. .. .. .. .. | .. | .. |
| XXXIV. | .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | 1-31 .. .. .. .. .. | .. | .. |
| XXXV. | 9-15,16$^{a}$,19,20$^{a}$,22$^{b}$-29 .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | 1-7,16$^{b}$-18,20$^{b}$,21,22$^{a}$ .. .. | .. | 8 |
| XXXVI. | 1-19,31-35$^{abd}$,36-43 .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | 20-30,35$^{c}$ .. .. .. .. | .. | .. |
| XXXVII. | 1,2$^{a}$,28$^{a}$,36 .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | 2$^{b}$-27,28$^{b}$-35 .. .. .. .. | .. | .. |
| XXXVIII. | .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | 1-30 .. .. .. .. .. | .. | .. |
| XXXIX. | .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | 1-23 .. .. .. .. .. | .. | .. |
| XL. | .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 2,3$^{a}$,4,5$^{a}$,6-23 .. .. .. | 1,3$^{b}$,5$^{b}$.. .. .. .. .. | .. | .. |
| XLI. | .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 1-30,32-34,36-39,44,45,47,56,57 | 31,35,40-43,46,48-55 .. .. | .. | .. |
| XLII. | .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 5,6$^{a}$,7$^{a}$ .. .. .. .. | 1-4,6$^{b}$,7$^{b}$-38 .. .. .. .. | .. | .. |
| XLIII. | .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | 1-34 .. .. .. .. .. | .. | .. |
| XLIV. | .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | 1-34 .. .. .. .. .. | .. | .. |
| XLV. | .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 16-18,21$^{a}$ .. .. .. | 1-15,19,20,21$^{b}$-28 .. .. | .. | .. |
| XLVI. | 6-12$^{a}$,13-20$^{ac}$,21-26$^{abd}$,27 .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | 1-5,12$^{b}$,20$^{b}$,26$^{c}$,28-34 .. .. | .. | .. |
| XLVII. | 7-11$^{abd}$,27$^{b}$,28 .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | 1-6,11$^{ca}$,12-27$^{a}$,29-31 .. .. | .. | .. |
| XLVIII. | 3-7 .. .. .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | 1,2,8-22 .. .. .. .. | .. | .. |
| XLIX. | 1$^{a}$,28$^{b}$-33 .. .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | 1$^{b}$-28$^{a}$.. .. .. .. .. | .. | .. |
| L. | 13 .. .. .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | 1-12,14-26 .. .. .. .. | .. | .. |
| Ex. I. | 1-7 .. .. .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. .. | .. | .. |
| II. | 23$^{b}$-25 .. .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. .. | .. | .. |
| VI. | 2-7 .. .. .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. | .. .. .. .. .. .. | .. | .. |

N.B. In the above, no account is taken of the brief editorial notes of explanation, 'that is Zoar,' 'that is the Salt Sea,' &c. in G.xiv.2,3,7,8,17, xxiii.2,19, xxxv.6,19, xxxvi.43, xlviii.7.

(i) In the following Analysis E, $E_2$, J, $J_2$, D, are used to represent the *Elohist*, *Second Elohist*, *Jehovist*, *Second Jehovist*, and *Later Editor*,—E, $E_2$, J, D, corresponding generally to the writers, A, B, C, D, in the Analysis of BOEHMER.

(ii) In our view $E_2$ is not a different writer from J, but represents J at an *earlier* stage of his literary activity.

(iii) In our view, the later writers made only *successive supplementary additions* to the original narrative of E, so that $E_2$ may refer to E, J to E or to $E_2$, D to E, $E_2$, or J: whereas HUPFELD and BOEHMER regard $E_2$ and J as the authors of *complete, original, independent narratives.*

(iv) In our view also, D is identical with the *Deuteronomist* of Josiah's time, who *edited* the Tetrateuch as it came into his hands, with the supplementary insertions of the previous writers, interpolating also his own additions.

According to BOEHMER also, D lived in Josiah's time; but he does *not* identify him with the Deuteronomist; and he regards him as having *compiled* the present Book of Genesis out of the three original independent documents, A, B, C, inserting also his own additions.

(*v*) When any word or phrase occurs repeatedly with any one of the writers, all the passages in which it is found are all given at the *first* place where it appears, and reference is made back to this in the subsequent notices.

(vi) The asterisk (*) denotes those words or phrases, which occur *only* with one particular writer throughout the Book of Genesis.

(vii) *v.*$2^a$, *v.*$2^b$, &c. denote the *first, second,* &c. clauses of *v.*2; *v.*$3^{ad}$ denotes the *first* and *fourth* clauses of *v.*3; *v.*$4^p$ denotes a *part* of *v.*4.

# CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF GENESIS.

## 1. i.1–31, *Elohist.*

*(i) *v.*11, &c. 'after his (its, their) kind,' i.11,12,12,21,21,24,24,25,25,25, vi.20, 20,20, vii.14,14,14,14.

*(ii) *v.*20, &c. שֶׁרֶץ, 'swarm,' שֹׁרֵץ, 'swarming-things,' i.20,20,21, vii.21,21, viii.17, ix.7, E.i.7.

*(iii) *v.*21, 'every living soul,' i.21, ix.10,12,15,16.

*(iv) *v.*22, פְּרֵה וּרְבָה, 'fructify and multiply,' i.22,28, viii.17, ix.1,7, xvii.(2 + 6), 20, xxviii.3, xxxv.11, xlvii.27$^{b}$, xlviii.4,

*comp.* גְּבַר וּרְבָה, 'be mighty and multiply,' vii.18$^{a}$.

(v) *v.*22,28, 'and Elohim blessed them;'

*comp.* 'and Elohim blessed the seventh day,' ii.3;
'and He (Elohim) blessed them (him, me),' v.2, xxxv.9, xlviii.3;
'and Elohim blessed Noah and his sons,' ix.1;
'and Elohim blessed Isaac his son,' xxv.11$^{a}$;
'and may El Shaddai bless thee,' xxviii. 3.

*(vi) *v.*25, 'all creeping-things of the ground,' as in vi.20;

*comp.* 'all that creepeth (upon) the ground,' vii.8, ix.2.

N.B. E uses אֲדָמָה, 'ground,' *only* in the above connection, though he has also 'creeping upon the earth,' i.26,28,30, vii.14; whereas J uses freely אֲדָמָה, and in cases where אֶרֶץ would seem more suitable (3.iii), but never in the above connection, though he has 'creeping-things' in vi.7, vii.23.

*(vii) *v.*26, 'every creeping-thing that creepeth upon the earth,' as in vii.14;

*comp.* 'every living-thing that creepeth upon the earth,' i.28;
'everything creeping upon the earth,' i.30, viii.19;
'that creepeth upon the earth,' vii.21.

*(viii) *v.*29,30, אָכְלָה, 'food,' i.29,30, vi.21, ix.3.

*(ix) *v.*30, 'every animal of the earth,' i.30, ix.2,10,10.

## 2. ii.1–4$^{a}$, *Elohist.*

(i) *v.*3, 'and Elohim blessed the seventh day,' (1.v).

(ii) *v.*4[a] was left doubtful in (IV.30–33); but I now assign it to E for the reasons given in (IV.30), *viz.*:—

(*α*) '*the* Heaven and *the* Earth,' as in i.1, ii.1; whereas in *v.*4[b] we have 'Earth and Heaven,' in inverted order, and without the articles, as in xiv.19,22;

(*β*) 'in their creation,' *comp.* 'in the day of their creation,' v.2;

(*γ*) the whole clause, 'these are the generations of the Heaven and the Earth in their creation,' suits well the account of the Creation in i, in which is described the actual creation of 'the Heaven,' *v.*8, and of 'the Earth,' *v.*10, and does not suit that in ii, where we read only about the formation of *man*, *v.*7, *plants*, *v.*9, *animals*, *v.*19, and *woman*, *v.*22.

With ILGEN, p.4, I conceive that these words may have stood originally as an inscription at the beginning of G.i at the *head* of the matter to which they relate, like the other inscriptions of the same writer, as given below, and may have been removed to their present position, at the *end* of the corresponding narrative, by some later writer, either the Jehovist himself or a Compiler.

In any case, the involved construction in *v.*4, when compared with the verses which precede and follow it, is a clear sign that this verse, as it now stands, cannot have proceeded in an original independent form from the pen of either of the two principal writers, but contains expressions of both fused together, to form the connecting link between two distinct narratives.

(iii) *v.*4[a], 'these are the generations of the Heaven and the Earth;'

*comp.* 'this is the book of the generations of Adam,' v.1;

'these are the generations of Noah (Shem, Jacob),' vi.9, xi.10, xxxvii.2[a];

'and these are the generations of Terah (Esau),' xi.27, xxxvi.1,9;

'and these are the generations of Ishmael (Isaac) the son of Abraham,' xxv.12,19;

J has also 'these are the generations of the sons of Noah,' x.1.

## 3. ii.4[b]–25, *Jehovist.*

*(i) *v.*4[b], &c. 'Jehovah-Elohim,' ii.4[b],5,7,8,9,15,16,18,19,21,22, iii.1,8,8,9,13,14, 21,22,23—*twenty-four* times; only *once* besides in the Pentateuch, E.ix.30, and *ten* times besides in the Bible, Jon.iv.6, Ps.lxxii.18, 2S.vii.22,25, 1Ch.xxviii.20, xxix.1, 2Ch.i.9, vi.41,42, xxvi.18.

*(ii) *v.*5,5, טֶרֶם, 'not yet,' ii.5,5, xix.4, xxiv.15,45, xxvii.4,33, xxxvii.18, xli.50, xlv.28.

*(iii) *v.*6, 'face of the *ground*,' ii.6, iv.14, vi.1,7, vii.4,23[a], viii.8,13[b];

*comp.* 'families of the *ground*,' xli.3, xxviii.14; 'into this *ground*,' xxviii.15.

N.B. So also J has 'dust of the *ground*,' ii.7, whereas everywhere else in the Bible we find 'dust of the *earth*,' G.xiii.16, xxviii.14, E.viii.16,17,17, 2S.xxii.43, 2Ch.i.9, Job xiv.19, Is.xl.12, Am.ii.7,—and 'out of the *ground*,' ii.9,19, for which E has 'let the *earth* bring forth,' i.11,24,—also 'till thou return unto the *ground*,' iii.19, but Ecc.xii.7, 'then shall the dust return upon (in some MSS. 'unto') the *earth*.' It is plain, therefore, that J uses אֲדָמָה by preference, whereas E uses אֶרֶץ, (1.vi. N.B.).

(iv) *v.*7, 'and Jehovah-Elohim formed the man (אָדָם) of dust out of the ground (אֲדָמָה),'—indirect derivation of the name 'Adam';

*comp.* similar derivations or allusions in ii.7, iii.15, iv.2,16, ix.25,27, xviii.12, xix.37,38, xxi.6, xxii.14, xxvi.21,33, xxvii.36, xxviii.19, xxix.33, xxxii.2,8,10,24, xxxiii.10, xxxv.18,18, xlviii.22, xlix.8,13,15,16,19,21,22; and see direct derivations in (3.xvi, 5.iii, 55.xii).

*(v) *v.*7,8,19, יֵצֶר 'form,' *comp.* יְצָר 'formation,' vi.5, viii.21.

*(vi) *v.*8, קֶדֶם, *v.*14, קִדְמָה, 'east,' ii.8,14, iii.24, iv.16, x.30, xi.2, xii.8,8, xiii.11, xxv.6,6, xxviii.14, xxix.1.

*(vii) *v.*8, 10, 'Eden,' *v.*11, 'Pison,' 'Havilah,' *v.*13, 'Gihon,' 'Cush,' *v.*14, 'Hiddekel,' 'Asshur,' 'Euphrates;'

*comp.* the geographical knowledge shown by this writer in ii.8,10–14, iv.16,17, x.1–32, xi.1–9, xxv.18.

(viii) *v.*9, 'pleasant of appearance';

*comp.* 'fair of appearance,' xii.11, 'good of appearance,' xxiv.16.

*(ix) *v.*9,17, 'tree of the knowledge of good and evil;'

*comp.* 'knowing good and evil,' iii.5;
'for knowledge of good and evil,' iii.22;
'we are not able to speak unto thee evil or good,' xxiv.50;
'lest thou speak with Jacob from good unto evil,' xxxi.24,29; also xliv.4, l.20.

*(x) *v.*10, הִפָּרֵד, 'be separated,' ii.10, x.5,32, xiii.9,11,14, xxv.23, *comp.* xxx.40.

*(xi) *v.*15, וַיַּנִּיחֵ, 'put-down,' ii.15, xix.16, xxxix.16, xlii.33, *comp.* נוּחַ, 'settle,' viii.4[a].

(xii) *v.*18, 'and Jehovah-Elohim said, It is not good the man's being alone; I will make for him a help over-against him;'

*comp.* similar secret speeches ascribed to Jehovah, ii.18, iii.22, vi.3,7, viii.21, xi.6, xviii.17,20,21.

*(xiii) *v.*18, לְבַד, 'apart,' ii.18, xxi.28,29, xxvi.1, xxx.40, xxxii.16(17), xlii.38, xliii.32,32,32, xliv.20, xlvi.26[c], xlvii.26.

*(xiv) *v.*20, מָצָא, 'find,' ii.20, iv.14,15, vi.8, viii.9, xi.2, xvi.7, xviii.3,26,28,29, 30,30,31,32, xix.11,15,19, xxvi.12,19,32, xxvii.20, xxx.14,27, xxxi.32,33,34,35,37, xxxii.5(6),19(20), xxxiii.8,10,15, xxxiv.11, xxxvi.24, xxxvii.15,17,32, xxxviii.20, 22,23, xxxix.4, xli.38, xliv.8,9,10,12,16,16,17,34, xlvii.14,25,29, l.4.

(xv) *v.*23, 'this time,' ii.23, xviii.32, xxix.34,35, xxx.20[b], xxxiii.3, xlvi.30, 'these two times,' xxvii.36, xliii.10, *comp.* 'these two years,' xlv.6,—also $E_2$(xli.32).

*(xvi) *v.*23, 'to this it shall be called Woman (אִשָּׁה), *for* she was taken out of Man (אִישׁ)';

*comp.* similar direct derivations in ii.23, iii.20, iv.25, x.25, xvi.11,13, xxvi.20,22, xxix.32, xxxii.30, xli.51,52, *comp.* xxxi.49, and (3.iv).

(xvii) *v.*24, עַל־כֵּן, 'therefore,' ii.24, xi.9, xvi.14, xviii.5, xix.8,22, xx.6[b], xxi.31, xxxii.32(33), xxxiii.10,17, xxxviii.26, xlii.21, xlvii.22,—also D(x.9).

*(xviii) *v.*24, עָזַב, 'forsake, leave,' ii.24, xxiv.27, xxviii.15, xxxix.6,12,13,15,18 xliv.22,22, l.8.

*(xix) *v.*24, דָּבַק, 'cleave,' ii.24, xix.19, xxxi.23, xxxiv.3.

(xx) J uses *strong anthropomorphisms*, Jehovah being spoken of as:—

forming the man of dust out of the ground, *v.*7;
breathing into his nostrils, *v.*7;
planting a garden, *v.*8;
taking the man, and leaving him in the garden, *v.*15;
reasoning within Himself in human fashion, *v.*18;
bringing to the man the birds and beasts, *v.*19;
desiring to see what he would call them, *v.*19;
taking-out one of the man's ribs, *v.*21;
closing-up the flesh in its place, *v.*21;
making the rib into a woman, *v.*22;
bringing the woman to the man, *v.*22;

*comp.* similar strong anthropomorphisms in iii.8,8,9,11,21,22,24, iv.4,5,6,7,9,15, vi.3,6,7, vii.16$^{b}$, viii.21, xi.5,7, xviii.8,13,15,17,20,21,23–32,33, xxii.1.

E has also some anthropomorphic expressions, but much less incongruous than those of the Jehovist; thus E speaks of Elohim as 'speaking' to Noah, Abraham, Jacob, Moses, 'appearing' to Abram and Jacob, 'making a covenant' with Noah and Abram, 'remembering' Noah, Abraham, Rachel, 'remembering' His covenant, 'going-up' from Abraham, xvii.22, and from Jacob, xxxv.13.

## 4. iii.1–24, *Jehovist.*

*(i) *v.*1,8,8, &c. 'Jehovah-Elohim,' (3.i).

N.B. In *v.*1,3,5, J abstains from putting the name 'Jehovah' in the mouth of the serpent, and of the woman quoting, apparently, the serpent's words. But we shall find, as we proceed, that this writer often uses Elohim as well as Jehovah.

(ii) *v.*1,2,3,8,10, the 'garden,' as in ii.8,9,10,15,16.

(iii) *v.*1–3, 'is it so that Elohim has said,' &c. *comp.* the command in ii.16,17.

*(iv) *v.*1,14, 'animal of the *field*,' as in ii.19,20;

E has 'animal of the *earth*,' i.25,30.

(v) *v.*3, 'the tree which is in the midst of the garden,' *comp.* ii.9.

*(vi) *v.*3, נָגַע, 'touch,' iii.3, xii.17, xxvi.11,29, xxviii.12, xxxii.25(26),32(33),—also $E_2$(xx.6).

(vii) *v.*5, 'in the day of your eating of it,' *comp.* ii.17.

*(viii) *v.*5, 'knowing good and evil,' (3.ix).

(ix) *v.*7, 'they knew that they were naked,' *v.*10; 'I feared for I am naked'; *comp.* 'and they were both naked,' ii.25.

(x) *v.*8, 'cool of the day,' *comp.* 'heat of the day,' xviii.1.

(xi) *v.*11,17, 'the tree which I commanded thee not to eat of,' *comp.* ii.16,17.

*(xii) *v.*11, בִּלְתִּי, 'except,' iii.11, iv.15, xix.21, xxxviii.9, xliii.3, xlvii.18,—also $E_2$(xxi.26).

(xiii) *v.*13, 'what is this thou hast done?'—also $E_2$(110.xviii);

*comp.* 'what hast thou done?' iv.10,xxxi.26;
'what is this thou hast done to me (us)?' xii.18,xxvi.10;

'what is this Elohim hath done to us?' xlii.28;
'what deed is this that ye have done?' xliv.15.

(xiv) *v.*14, 'cursed art thou,' *v.*17, 'cursed is the ground';

*comp.* the mention of 'curses' in iii.14,17, iv.11, v.29, viii.21, ix.25, xii.3, xxvii.13,29.

*(xv) *v.*14,17, 'all the days,' iii.14,17, viii.22, xlii.9, xliv.32.

(xvi) *v.*15,15, שׁוּף, 'bruise,' used probably with a play upon שְׁפִיפֹן, 'adder or horned-snake,' xlix.17 (3.iv).

*(xvii) *v.*16, עֶצֶב, *v.*16,17, עִצָּבוֹן, 'pain,' as in v.29, *comp.* עָצַב, 'be pained,' vi.6, xxxiv.7, xlv.5.

*(xviii) *v.*17, בַּעֲבוּר, 'for the sake of,' iii.17, viii.21, xviii.29,31,32, xxi.30, xxvi.24, xxvii.4,19, xlvi.34.

(xix) *v.*18, 'herb of the field,' as in ii.5.

(xx) *v.*19, 'out of it wast thou taken—dust thou art,' *v.*23, 'the ground out of which he was taken';

*comp.* 'Jehovah-Elohim formed the man of dust out of the ground,' ii.7.

*(xxi) *v.*20, 'and the man called the name of his wife Eve (חַוָּה), *for* she was the mother of all living (חָי),' direct derivation as in (3.xvi).

(xxii) *v.*22, 'and Jehovah-Elohim said, Behold! the man has become as one of us, &c.,' (3.xii).

(xxiii) *v.*22, 'for knowledge of good and evil,' (3.ix).

(xxiv) *v.*22,24, 'the tree of life,' as in ii.9.

(xxv) *v.*23, 'serve the ground,' as in ii.5.

*(xxvi) *v.*24, חֶרֶב 'sword,' iii.24, xxvii.40, xxxi.26, xxxiv.25,26, xlviii.22.

*(xxvii) *v.*24, יָשַׁב, 'abide,' iii.24, ix.27, xvi.12, xxv.18, xxvi.2, xxxv.22ᵃ, xlix.13.

(xxviii) *v.*24, קֶדֶם, 'east,' (3.vi).

(xxix) *strong anthromorphisms* (3.xx), Jehovah being spoken of as—

walking in the breeze of the day, *v.*8;
making an audible sound in walking, *v.*8;
missing the man and calling for him, *v.*9;
questioning him as to what he had done, *v.*11;
making coats of skins, *v.*21;
clothing the man and woman, *v.*21;
reasoning within Himself in human fashion, *v.*22;
grudging the man being like Himself, *v.*22;
refusing to let him eat of the tree of life, *v.*22;
driving the man and woman out of the garden, *v.*24;
taking precautions to prevent their return to it, *v.*24.

## 5. iv.1–26, *Jehovist.*

This section belongs to the same writer as the two preceding sections, though he uses now 'Jehovah' throughout, except 'Elohim' once in *v.*25, and not 'Jehovah-Elohim.' This appears from the numerous references made in it throughout to ii.4ᵇ–iii.24; whereas there is not the slightest sign of any relationship to the Elohistic section, i.1–ii.4ᵃ.

*(i) *v.*1,17,25, 'know' carnally, iv.1,17,25, xix.8, xxiv.16.

(ii) *v.*1, 'Eve,' as in iii.20.

N.B. 'Eve' is nowhere named by E, nor anywhere in the O.T. except by J in iii.20,iv.1.

(iii) *v.*1, 'and she bare Cain (קַיִן), and said, I have acquired (קָנָה) &c.,' indirect derivation of the name 'Cain,' (3.iv);

*comp.* similar derivations in iv.1,v.29.

*(iv) *v.*2, 'add to bear'=bear again, *v.*12, 'add to give';

*comp.* similar formulæ in iv.2,12, viii.10,12,21,21, xviii.29, xxvi.1, xxxvii.5,8, xxxviii.5,26, xliv.23.

(v) *v.*2, the name 'Abel' (הֶבֶל), probably formed with an allusion to the meaning of the word, 'vanity, nothingness,' (3.iv);

(vi) *v.*2, 'serve the ground,' as in ii.5, iii.23.

*(vii) *v.*3,4,5, מִנְחָה, 'offering,' iv.3,4,5, xxxii.13(14),18(19),20(21),21(22), xxxiii.10, xliii.11,15,25,26.

*(viii) *v.*5,6, 'be kindled (*viz.* anger) to,' iv.5,6,xviii.30,32,xxx.2,xxxi.36,xxxiv.7, xliv.18, *comp.* xxxi.35, xxxix.19, xlv.5 (*ignescunt iræ Rutulo*, Æn.ix.66).

*(ix) *v.*7, רֵבֵץ, 'couch,' iv.7, xxix.2, xlix.9,14,25.

*(x) *v.*7, תְּשׁוּקָה, 'desire,' as in iii.16, only besides in Cant.vii.10(11), where it is used with עַל, but here in both places with אֶל.

(xi) *v.*7, 'and unto thee shall be its desire, and thou shalt rule over it,'

*comp.* iii.16, 'and unto thy husband shall be thy desire, and he shall rule over thee.'

*(xii) *v.*8, &c. הָרַג, 'kill,' iv.8,14,15,23,25, xii.12, xxvi.7, xxvii.41,42, xxxiv.25,26, xxxvii.20,26, xlix.6.

(xiii) *v.*10, 'what hast thou done?' (4.xiii).

*(xiv) *v.*11, 'cursed art thou,' (4.xiv).

*(xv) *v.*11, 'take out of the hand of,' iv.11, xxi.30, xxxiii.10, xxxviii.20, xlviii.22;

*comp.* 'deliver out of the hand of,' xxxii.11,11, xxxvii.21,22;

'buy out of the hand of,' xxxiii.19, xxxix.1.

(xvi) *v.*12, 'serve the ground,' as in ii.5, iii.23, iv.2.

(xvii) *v.*12,14, נָע וָנָד, 'fugitive and vagabond';

*comp.* similar *alliterations*, iv.12,14, xi.3, xviii.27, xxvii.36.

(xviii) גָּדַל מִן, 'be greater than,' iv.13, xxxix.9, xli.40, xlviii.19;

*comp.* פָּלָא מִן, 'be more wonderful than,' xviii.14;

עָצַם מִן, 'be stronger than,' xxvi.16;

קָטַן מִן, 'be less than,' xxxii.10(11).

*(xix) *v.*13, נָשָׂא, 'lift-up'=forgive, iv.13, xviii.24,26, xix.21, l.17,17.

*(xx) *v.*14, 'face of the *ground*,' (3.iii).

(xxi) *v.*15, הַכֹּה, 'smite,' iv.15, viii.21, xix.11, xxxii.8(9),11(12), xxxiv.30, xxxvi.35[p], xxxvii.21,—also $J_2$(xiv.5,7,15,17).

(xxii) *v.*16, the name 'Nod' (נוֹד) derived, apparently, from נָד, 'vagabond,' in *v* 12,14 (3.iv).

*(xxiii) *v.*16, 'Eden,' as in ii.8,10,15,iii.23,24.

*(xxiv) *v.*16, 'Nod' = Hind, India (?), *v.*17, 'Enoch' = Chanoge? (3.vii).

*(xxv) *v.*16, קֶדְמָה, 'east,' (3.vi).

*(xxvi) *v.*18,18,&c., יָלַד, 'beget,' iv.18,18,18,22, x.13,15,24,24,26, xxii.23, xxv.3; E uses always הוֹלִיד (10.viii), which $E_2$ has once in xl.20.

*(xxvii) *v.*20,21,22, J describes the *beginnings* of different arts, &c. as 'cattle-keeping,' iv.20, 'music,' iv.21, 'smithery,' iv.22, 'worship,' iv.26;

*comp.* vi.1, ix.20.

*(xxviii) *v.*25, 'she called his name Seth (שֵׁת), *for* Elohim hath set (שָׁת) to me another seed &c.,' direct derivation of the name Seth (3.xvi).

(xxix) *v.*26, הֵחֵל, 'begin,' iv.26,vi.1,ix.20,x.8, xi.6, xli.54, xliv.12—also D(x.8); *comp.* בַּתְּחִלָּה, 'in the beginning,' xiii.3, xliii.18,20—also $E_2$(xli.21).

*(xxx) *v.*26, 'call on the name of Jehovah,' iv.26,xii.8,xiii.4,xxi.33,xxvi.25.

(xxxi) *strong anthropomorphisms* (3.xx), Jehovah being spoken of as—

showing respect to Abel, and not to Cain, *v.*4,5;

reasoning with Cain, *v.*6,7;

questioning Cain, *v.*9;

setting a sign to (or on) Cain, *v.*15.

N.B. In *v.*25 'Adam' is first used necessarily as a Proper Name; in all previous passages we have הָאָדָם, 'the man,' except in ii.20,iii.17,21, where it stands in the Masoretic text לְאָדָם, which should, perhaps, have been pointed לֶאָדָם. But in *v.*25 we have 'Adam,' without the article, as subject of the verb, and therefore certainly used as a Proper Name. Perhaps the Jehovist has taken it from E(v.1).

On this verse HUPFELD notes, p.129: 'Also the etymological play on 'Seth' must, notwithstanding the name 'Elohim,' be Jehovistic, and not an Elohistic note, since it refers to the murder of Abel by Cain. The name 'Elohim' appears often in such etymologies in a Jehovistic connection: *comp.* G.xxx.' Rather, we shall see, that these etymologies in xxx belong, most probably, to E. But J not unfrequently uses 'Elohim' in speaking, as here, of God granting a favour or blessing (*comp.* xxxiii.5,11).

6. HUPFELD regards the whole of G.iv as *Jehovistic*, as we do, and, indeed, the evidence produced above seems decisive on this point. But he writes on *v.*17, &c. as follows, *p.*129:—

*v.*17–23, the genealogy of the Cainites, must to all appearance have been originally identical with that of the Sethites in the Elohistic document, G.v, or only a different tradition of it.[1] And since it breaks off with Lamech, who stands as father of Noah at the end of the Elohistic genealogy of the Sethites, it consequently fills up completely the whole interval to the time of the Deluge, and at the same time carries on the moral history of Cain. Meanwhile it must have been regarded by the Jehovist,—at all events, in the form in which it lay before him,—according to the tradition which he followed, as a *Cainite* genealogy, and therefore as belonging to an accursed or banished race, which had died out in a strange land, and stood in no connection with the following history. He cannot therefore be supposed to have made up that connection by means of *this* genealogy instead of the Sethite.[2]

In fact he gives us at the end of this chapter, *v.*25,26, the beginning of the Sethite genealogy, *viz.* the first two members of it, Seth and Enos, as well as an etymological play upon the name of Noah, v.29, and Noah himself, vi.8, &c. From this it appears that he must also have known and given the Sethite genealogy. (3) For it cannot have been adapted by the Supplementer out of the E. genealogy in v, 'to serve as a transition,' as TUCH supposes; since that would only explain, at all events, the mention of the first name, Seth, and not show for what reason the second also, Enos, is named, or why, if this one, more also are not named.(4) Rather, it has manifestly been retained by the Compiler out of the Jehovistic document just up to this point and no further, because of the peculiar notices about Seth and especially about Enos(5): whereas the rest has been omitted, doubtless because it supplied no special information but only mere names, and so would have given a mere repetition of the matter contained in the E. document;—except the etymological play upon the name of Noah, v.29, which he inserted in the midst of the E. genealogy, where it betrays itself at once as a foreign element, through the departure from the analogy of the whole chapter, and the disturbance of the symmetry of this particular clause. In fact, from its decidedly Jehovistic character, in respect of the Divine name and its other contents, it has all along been recognised as Jehovistic. (6)

7. With great respect I must express my dissent from the above judgment of Prof. HUPFELD for the following reasons:—

(1) The resemblance of the Cainite to the Sethite genealogy, which BUTTMANN first pointed out, *Mythol.*i.170, &c., and which HUPFELD, p.129 note, regards as proved 'beyond all doubt,' is certainly so marked, as to imply very strongly *some* connection between the two. Thus *Adam*, *Enoch*, *Lamech*, are found in both genealogies; in the one we have קֵינָן, = קֵינָן, in the other, *comp.* Lot = Lotan; in the one we have חֲנוֹךְ, עִירָד, מְחוּיָאֵל, מְתוּשָׁאֵל, in the other יֶרֶד, מַהֲלַלְאֵל, חֲנוֹךְ, מְתוּשֶׁלַח, where the first three of the one set are supposed to represent the first three of the other *in inverted order*; and, lastly, in the one we have the sequence *Adam*, *Cain*, &c., in the other *Enos*, *Kenan*, &c., where both *Adam* (אָדָם) and *Enos* (אֱנוֹשׁ) mean 'man.'

But, though the resemblances are here very noticeable, they are by no means sufficient (as it seems to me) to imply that the two genealogies were originally identical—different versions of the same Sethite genealogy. Rather, I agree here with KNOBEL, *Gen.*p.54, who considers that the Cainite list of names may have been merely framed upon this model of the E. genealogy in v. In short, it appears to me most probable that the Jehovist, who has introduced in iv the story of Cain and Abel, as a terrible illustration of the consequences of the Fall, has merely *imitated* the Sethite genealogy which lay before him in the E. document, in order to give some account of the Cainites.

(2) It seems a very strong assumption to suppose that the Jehovist *mistook* for a *Cainite* genealogy what was in reality a *Sethite*. But he does not introduce the genealogy here to establish a *connection* between his account of Cain and the

following history. He does it merely to introduce his own geographical knowledge about the land of Nod (*India*?) and the city of Enoch (*Khănoch* = Chanoge?),* and at all events his notions about the early progress of civilisation and the arts in the *eastern parts of Asia*, 'in the land of Nod on the east of Eden,' iv.16. He makes the connection required by introducing part of the Sethite genealogy in iv.25,26.

(3) He must have *known* the Sethite genealogy, and we suppose that it lay before him in the E. document: but why must he have *given* it,—unless, indeed, we set out with the preconceived notion that he wrote an original, independent document?

(4) It seems unnecessary to explain why two names are named, and two only, of the Sethite list. He did not, of course, wish to quote the whole of them, and he had something to say about each of these two.

(5) It would seem strange, if the Jehovist had really given originally, as HUPFELD supposes, all the names of the Sethite, as well as the Cainite, genealogy, that he left nothing for the Compiler to retain in connection with any of the other Sethite names, except only Noah—whereas he gives us so many details with reference to the names in the Cainite list, iv.17,19,20,21,22,23,24.

(6) We suppose v.29 to be merely a note of the Jehovist upon the E. datum to which it refers.

8. We have gone more fully into the above question, because of its great importance to the theory maintained by HUPFELD, *viz.* that the Jehovist did not merely supplement the matter which already lay before him, but wrote an original independent narrative, which was afterwards combined with the Elohistic and other documents into one whole by the hand of a later Compiler. Though in Part IV we suspended the expression of any deliberate judgment on this point, the evidence which now lies before us, in the results of our examination of the whole Book of Genesis, has compelled us to a contrary conclusion.

9. BOEHMER, *p.*126, &c. assigns the whole chapter to a later *Compiler* of the time of Josiah: but the evidence above pro-

* 'Nod lay eastward of Eden: and if the compiler (as often happens in Arabic with foreign names) was deceived in imagining that there was a Semitic article in *Hind*, (Heb. and Arab. for *India*, for which הוֹדוּ *Hoddu* = *Hondu*, stands in Esth.i.1,) as if it had been הֹנֹד, we should in that case, of course, with J. D. MICHAELIS, have here an expression for India in the widest meaning of the word . . . We are reminded also by the name of Cain's city, *Khănoch*, of the very ancient commercial city of *Chanoge*, Arab. *Khanug*, in northern India, celebrated in the early epics of the Hindoos, and called by the ancients Canogyza, of which the narrator might have heard.' Von BOHLEN, *Heywood's Edition*, p.90.

duced seems to be decisive against this supposition. He believes, however, as we do, that the writer has merely adopted the Sethite names in *v.*25,26 from the E. genealogy in v, and writes as follows, *p.*138,139:—

If the Compiler had put one after the other the two genealogies in iv and v, without any further explanation, it would then have been left to the reader to make of it what he could and would; and many, perhaps, would have hit upon the idea that, besides Cain and Abel, Adam must have had also a younger son, Seth, from whom was derived that line of the Sethites, the details of which followed those of the other so much the more fitly, inasmuch as they led on to the sons of Noah. The Compiler thought it good to give full expression to this view, which was also his own. And therefore he adds at the end of chap. iv, '*And Adam knew again his wife, and she bare a son, and she called his name Seth, for Elohim hath set to me another seed in place of Abel for Cain slew him*,' *v.*25. This etymology with this reference is probably an invention of the Compiler. In this way the Sethite race in v is contrasted with the Cainite race in iv, a quite unhistorical fancy, which serves the purpose of severing the holy line as far as possible from the heathen.

From the genealogy thus introduced by him the Compiler takes here still one member more, in order to fasten a remark upon it. He might certainly have introduced this more fittingly after v.6, just as in that chapter a religious notice stands in the case of Enoch. But he has just written down here at once what came to his pen, '*And to Seth, to him also was born a son, and he called his name Enos: then was it begun to call on the name of Jehovah*,' *v.*26, *i.e.* in plain words, then began the worship of Jehovah, whom men revered as God and to whom they prayed. This datum does not agree with the view of the First Narrator [Elohist], according to whom the name 'Jehovah' was not known before Moses; nor does it accord with this very section, since in iv.1 'Jehovah' occurs as the Divine Name in the mouth of Eve. . . . . Probably, the Compiler made this observation entirely on his own responsibility. He wished to ascribe to the holy line of the Sethites, in opposition to the corrupt line of the Cainites, the institution of the worship of Jehovah: the name 'Enos' seemed specially suited for the introduction of this notice: it is the human weakness (indicated by אֱנוֹשׁ, *Enosh*,) which urges on to prayer to the Strong God.

*Ans.* We agree with the above, except that we certainly, with HUPFELD, ascribe the whole chapter to the Jehovist. There is no necessary inconsistency between *v.*1 and *v.*26, though the Jehovist, as we shall see, was not very careful to avoid contradictions. He may have supposed that the *name* 'Jehovah' was known from the very first, but that the *worship* of Jehovah did not begin till the days of Enos, or, rather, perhaps, of *Seth*, about the time when his first son was born.

10. v.1–32, *Elohist*, except *v.*29.

This section is the continuation of the E. narrative, i.1–ii.4[a],

to which it refers distinctly, but not at all to the J. passage, ii.4$^{b}$–iv.26.

*(i) *v.*1, 'in the likeness of Elohim made He him': *comp.* i.27, 'in the image of Elohim created He him.'

(ii) *v.*1,2, בָּרָא, 'create,' as in i.1,21,27,27, ii.3,4$^{a}$,—also J(vi.7).

*(iii) *v.*1,3, דְּמוּת, 'likeness,' as in i.26.

*(iv) *v.*2, 'male and female created He them,' as in i.27.

(v) *v.*2, 'He blessed them,' (1.v).

*(vi) *v.*3, 'in His likeness, after His image';
*comp.* 'in our image, after our likeness,' i.26.

(vii) *v.*3,5, &c., date of Seth's birth, Adam's death, &c.; *comp.* the dates of births, marriages, deaths, and other important events, noted precisely by E in the history of all the patriarchs before and after the Flood, from Adam to Esau and Jacob, *viz.* from *Adam* to *Lamech*, v.3,5, &c. 28,31, *Noah*, v.32, vii.6,11, viii.13$^{a}$, ix.29, *Shem* to *Terah*, xi.10,11, &c. 26,32, *Abraham*, xii.4$^{b}$, xvi.3,16, xvii.1,17,24, xxi.5, xxv.7, *Sarah*, xvii.17, xxiii.1, *Ishmael*, xvii.25, xxv.7, *Isaac*, xxv.20,26$^{b}$, xxxv.28, *Esau*, xxvi.34, *Jacob*, xlvii.9,28, *Joseph*, xxxvii.2$^{a}$.

Probably E gave also, in the portions now lost, Jacob's age at his marriage, and at the birth of his first-born, as he has given that of Isaac, xxv.20,26$^{b}$. We find Jehovistic notices in xxix.18,20, xxxi.38,41, from which, *with the aid of the E. data.* these dates may be determined; but these are very different from the formulæ of E. Also in xli.46, l.22,26, we have J. notices of the age of Joseph.

*(viii) *v.*3,4, &c. הוֹלִיד, 'beget,' v.3,4, &c., *twenty-eight* times, vi.10, xi.10,11, &c., *twenty-nine* times, xvii.20, xxv.19, xlviii.6;—also $E_2$(xl.20);
J has יָלַד always (5.xxvi).

*(ix) *v.*3,6, &c. מְאַת, 'hundred,' v.3,6,18,25,28, vii.24, viii.3$^{b}$, xi.10,25, xxi.5, xxv.7,17, xxxv.28, xlvii.9,28; E has also מֵאָה, xvii.17, xxiii.1;
J has only מֵאָה, (13.v).

## 11. v.29, *Jehovistic.*

This verse is plainly Jehovistic, as appears not only from its containing the name 'Jehovah,' but also from its referring distinctly to the J. section, ii.4$^{b}$–iv.26.

(i) 'and he called his name Noah (נֹחַ), saying, This shall comfort (יְנַחֵם) us;' derivation of the name 'Noah' as in (5.iii); *comp.* also (3.iv).

N.B. The true derivation of this name is from נוּחַ, 'rest.'

*(ii) נִחַם, 'comfort,' v.29, vi.6,7, xxiv.67, xxvii.42, xxxvii.35,35, xxxviii.12, l.21.

*(iii) 'about our work and about the pain of our hands,' *comp.* the 'work' and 'pain' imposed on Adam in iii.17–19.

*(iv) עִצָּבוֹן, 'pain,' as in iii.16,16,17(4.xvii),—*nowhere else in the Bible.*

*(v) 'the ground which Jehovah cursed'; *comp.* 'cursed is the ground,' iii.17.

*(vi) the 'curse,' (4.xiv).

N.B. The original conclusion of *v.*28 was, no doubt, 'and begat Noah,' as in *v.*6,9,12,15,18,21,25. The Jehovist (or the Compiler) has substituted 'a son' for 'Noah,' in order to introduce the explanation of the name. It may be noted that E writes in *v.*3, '*and begat* [not 'begat *a son*'] in his likeness, after his image, *and called his name Seth.*' This also suggests that he did not write what now stands in *v.*28,29, 'and begat *a son*, and called his name Noah.'

12. BOEHMER, *p.*140, gives v.29 to the *Compiler*, and writes:—

This addition can have been made for no other object but to prepare the way for a later insertion of the *Compiler*, *viz.*, that about the introduction of the cultivation of the vine by Noah, ix.20.(1) Wine is represented as 'comfort' for the painful toil upon the earth after the curse had passed upon it.(2) To the mourner is given the 'cup of *comforts*,' Jer.xvi.7: in Pro.xxxi.6,7, says Lemuel, 'Give strong drink to him that is ready to perish, and wine unto those that are bitter of soul: let him drink and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more.' That even the earth, though under the curse, still brought forth such a product as the vine, might serve as 'comfort' to the human race. On account of this reference to a matter, which is only communicated by the Compiler, we cannot assent to HUPFELD's view, that this etymology, as well as iv.25,26, belongs to a Sethite genealogy of the Jehovist, which has been only partially retained by the Compiler.(3)

*Ans.* (1) We also assign ix.20 to the *same* writer as v.29, but give *both* to J.

(2) If v.29 was really meant to prepare for ix.20, there surely would have been something said in the latter passage to indicate such a connection. At present there is not the slightest sign of this; for the account of Noah's drunkenness can hardly be regarded in this light.

(3) We also have expressed dissent from HUPFELD's view (7). But the matter is explained very naturally by supposing that the Jehovist, who shows a great partiality for deriving names, is here, in v.29, merely exercising his fancy upon the name of Noah, who fills a prominent place in the subsequent narrative.

13. vi.1–8, *Jehovist*, except *v.*4.

*(i) *v.*1, the *beginning* of a large population,' (5.xxvii).

(ii) *v.*1, הֵחֵל, 'begin' (5.xxix).

*(iii) *v.*1,7, 'face of the ground' (3.iii).

(iv) *v.*3, 'and Jehovah said, My spirit shall not for ever preside in man, &c., *v.*7, 'and Jehovah said, I will wipe-out man, &c.';

*comp.* similar speeches ascribed to Jehovah, (3.xii).

(v) *v.*3, מֵאָה, 'hundred,' vi.3, xxvi.12, xxxiii.19, l.22,26.

*(vi) *v.*5, יֵצֶר, 'formation,' (3.v).

*(vii) *v.*6,7, נָחַם, 'comfort,' (11.ii).

*(viii) *v.*6, 'he was pained,' (4.xvii).

*(ix) *v.*7, מָחָה, 'wipe-out,' vi.7, vii.4,23,23, used by J throughout the story of the Deluge: whereas E uses שָׁחַת or הִשְׁחִית, 'corrupt' = destroy (19.vii).

*(x) *v.*7, 'from off (מֵעַל), the face of the ground,' as in iv.14.

*(xi) *v.*7, 'from man unto beast,' vi.7, vii.23[a];

*comp.* 'from young-man and unto old man,' xix.4;

'from small and unto great,' xix.11.

*(xii) *v.*8, 'find favour in the eyes of,' vi.8, xviii.3, xix.19, xxx.27, xxxii.5, xxxiii.8,10,15, xxxiv.11, xxxix.4, xlvii.25,29, l.4, *comp.* xxxix.21.

(xiii) *strong anthropomorphisms* (3.xx), Jehovah being spoken of as:—

reasoning with Himself in human fashion, *v.*3,7;

repenting and being grieved at the heart, *v.*6,7.

N.B. In *v.*5 the E.V. and Vulg. have *Elohim*: but the Heb., Sam., and all the other ancient Versions and Targums have 'Jehovah,' except that the Sept. has Κύριος ὁ Θεός.

Also in *v.*2, occurs the phrase 'sons of Elohim'=angels. But this phrase might have been used by any writer, however thoroughly Jehovistic, since the expression 'sons of Jehovah' is never employed. So in the Jehovistic *frame-work* of the Book of Job the expression is twice used, i.6, ii.1, and in each case we have Elohim with the article, as here. In Job xxxviii.7 it is used without the article: in Ps.xxix.1, lxxxix.7, we have בְּנֵי אֵלִים, 'sons of the mighty-ones.'

14. Our view of the above passage agrees with that of HUPFELD, who observes very justly, on the datum in *v.*3, *p.*220:—

The measure of 120 years [here assigned as the future average duration of human life] is not certainly carried out in the following history, where generally a far higher measure of life appears down to the time of the Hebrew patriarchs. It must be remembered, however, that these statements of age are all from the E. document, while with the Jehovist there enters first in the case of Moses a mode of reckoning time with the round numbers of 120, 80, 40 years.

BOEHMER, *p.*141, ascribes *v.*1–4 to the 'Compiler,' except *v.*4[a], 'the Nephilim were on the earth in those days,' which he assigns to the Jehovist, and compares with the similar notices in xii.6, xiii.7, and regards as the 'kernel' of the whole passage: but he expresses a doubt, *p.*150, whether *v.*4[a] may not also belong to the Compiler.

15. vi.4, *Deuteronomistic.*

On this verse HUPFELD writes as follows, *p.*221:—

Still more loose and indistinct is the connection of *v.*4 with the preceding context. It begins abruptly with, 'the Giants (Nephilim) were on the earth in those days'—*the* Giants, with the article, as if they had been named already, or might be spoken of as well-known, of which alternatives only the last is applicable

here. In fact this name occurs also in N.xiii.33, where it is used of the Giants whom the spies found existing in Canaan; and there also they are set forth with the article as well-known, and actually with an additional statement, 'the Giants, *out of the 'Giants*,' which can only refer to the passage before us: so that both passages seem to point to each other. The clause 'they were on the earth' can therefore only signify that the Giants named in N.xiii were already at that time on the earth or *in the land*, i.e. Canaan—the latter being a notice like that about the Canaanites in xii.6, xiii.7. Hence it is only an *antiquarian notice* or *note*, such as we often find elsewhere, which betrays itself at once by its abruptness and the loose time-formula 'in those days,' as an awkwardly-inserted later interpolation, which only claims a place here through the additional clause, 'and also after the sons of God had gone in to the daughters of man, and (these) had borne to them,' [or 'and they had begotten to themselves,' since the verb here is masculine in form; see, however, G.xx.17, xxxi.43]. But this clause also betrays itself as artificially inserted, by its awkwardness and want of any suitable meaning. For, according to this, the Nephilim did not spring *only*, but merely *also*, from these marriages, so that they existed already, and were only in this way increased in number. Thus their first origin remains unexplained: rather, if only a portion of them was derived from this union of divine and human beings, and another portion was still older, the whole notice becomes useless and unmeaning. Probably, this is only a consequence of the awkward mode of expression . . . . . In the last clause, 'these are the mighty-men which were of old, the men of renown,' these Giants may, perhaps, be distinguished by the addition 'of old,' as *ante*diluvian from the *post*diluvian, as Nimrod, x.8. But, in any case, the clause cannot in this form be genuine, that is, it cannot have originated from the same source as the preceding matter, and can only be a later gloss, which the Compiler, or a yet later writer, has inserted in the Jehovistic text.

16. We agree with HUPFELD in regarding *v.*4 as a later insertion in the original J. narrative—the clause, 'after the sons of Elohim, &c.,' having been merely adopted from *v.*1,2, and the writer wishing to throw in an 'antiquarian' notice. But this notice appears to be twofold,—(i) that the Nephilim existed in those early times (and here the writer has not considered the consequences of the Deluge); (ii) that, from the offspring of the intercourse here described, sprung—*not* the Nephilim, but—the 'mighty-men of old,' *i.e.* Nimrod and others; the writer having here also, apparently, lost sight for the moment of the consequences of the Deluge, which was not so fully before his mind, inasmuch as he himself had not described it.

17. But who was this interpolator? It may have been, as

HUPFELD suggests, the Compiler or some other yet later writer. But we have seen that the hand of the Deuteronomist himself can be distinctly traced through a large portion of the Book of Joshua, and we shall see, as we proceed, similar traces of his hand in the Book of Genesis.

It seems, therefore, not at all improbable that, as suggested in (III.566), the Deuteronomist may have revised the Tetrateuch, as it came into his hands, before writing the Book of Deuteronomy itself:—

> The writer, who could conceive the grand idea of adding the whole Book of Deuteronomy to the existing roll of the Tetrateuch, would be almost certain, we may well believe, to have first revised the work of the older writers which had come into his hands, and to have inserted passages, here and there, if he saw any reason for so doing, in the original document. The wonder, we repeat, would be, if he did *not* do this.

According to this view, the Deuteronomist was merely the *Editor* of the First Four Books of the Pentateuch; whereas BOEHMER recognises a *Compiler*, who lived in the age of *Josiah*, but whom he does *not* identify at all with the Deuteronomist. We are agreed, then, as to the *age* in which this latest writer of Genesis lived, though not as to the exact character and extent of his work, nor as to his relation to the Deuteronomist. These are points which can only be settled by time, and after close and careful investigation, and a free discussion of the questions raised by such enquiries. But it is quite immaterial to the main issue, whether this latest writer in Genesis was an *Editor* or a *Compiler*, whether he *was* or *was not* the same as the Deuteronomist.

18. We suppose, then, that the verse before us is a notice of the Deuteronomist, corresponding to those remarkable instances of his habit of antiquarian research into the early history of the inhabitants of Canaan, which we find in the Book of Deuteronomy itself:—

> 'The Emim dwelt therein in times past, a people great and many and tall as the

Anakim, which also were accounted Rephaim (E.V. 'giants') as the Anakim: but the Moabites call them Emim,' D.ii.10,11;

'The Horim also dwelt in Seir aforetime, but the children of Esau inherited them, when they had destroyed them before them, and dwelt in their stead,' D.ii.12;

'That also was accounted a land of Rephaim; Rephaim dwelt in it aforetime; and the Ammonites call them Zamzummim, a people great and many and tall as the Anakim: but Jehovah destroyed them before them, and they inherited them and dwelt in their stead,' D.ii.20,21;

'And the Avim, which dwelt in villages unto Gaza, the Caphtorim, which came forth out of Caphtor, destroyed them, and dwelt in their stead,' D.ii.23.

The following phenomena may also be noticed:—

(i) The 'Rephaim' or Giants are mentioned in D.ii.11,20,20, iii.11,13, Jo.xii.4, xiii.12, xvii.15, xviii.16, and G.xv.20, *all*, probably, Deuteronomistic passages, and only twice besides in the Bible, G.xiv.5, Is.xvii.5;

(ii) the 'sons of Anak' or 'Anakim' are named in D.i.28, ii.10,11,21, ix.2, Jo.xi.21,22, xiv.12,15, xv.13,14, all, probably, Deut. passages, and *only* besides in the Bible in N.xiii.22, 28,33, and Ju.i.20;

(iii) גִּבּוֹר, 'mighty-one,' occurs besides in G.x.8,9,9, D.x.17, Jo.i.14, vi.2, viii.3, x.2,7, all Deut. passages, and *nowhere else in the Pentateuch* (53.vi);

(iv) 'men of name' occurs only besides in N.xvi.2: but the Deuteronomist uses 'name' in the sense of renown, D.xxvi.19.

## 19. vi.9–22, *Elohist*, except *v.*15,16.

(i) *v.*9, 'these are the generations of Noah,' (2. iii).

*(ii) *v.*9, 'in his generations (דֹּרֹת)';

*comp.* 'after their (your) generations,' xvii.7,9,12.

(iii) *v.*9, 'Noah walked with ELOHIM,' as in v.22,24.

*(iv) *v.*10, הוֹלִיד, 'beget,' (10.viii).

(v) *v.*11,12, would hardly have been written by one who had written *v.*5–8.

(vi) *v.*11,12, &c. שָׁחַת, הִשְׁחִית, 'corrupt' = destroy, vi.11,12,12,13,17, ix.11,15, used by E throughout the story of the Flood: J uses מָחָה, 'wipe-out' (13.ix).

*(vii) *v.*12, '*and Elohim saw* the earth, *and behold! it was* corrupted';

*comp.* '*and Elohim saw* all that He had made, *and behold! it was* very good,' i.31.

*(viii) *v.*12,13, &c., 'all flesh,' vi.12,13,17,19, vii.15,16,21, viii.17, ix.11,15, 16,16,17.

(ix) *v.*17, אֲנִי, 'I,' vi.17, ix.9,12, xvii.1, xxxv.11, xlviii.7, xlix.29, E.vi.2,5,7;

E uses אָנֹכִי only *once*, xxiii.4, whereas it occurs in the other portions of Genesis *fifty* times, while אֲנִי is found only *thirty* times.

(x) *v.*17, 'all flesh in which is a spirit of life';

*comp.* 'all in which is a living soul,' i.30.

*(xi) *v.*17, גָּוַע, 'expire,' vi.17, vii.21, xxv.8,17, xxxv.29, xlix.33.

*(xii) *v.*18, 'establish a covenant,' vi.18, ix.9,11,17, xvii.7,19,21, E.vi.4;

E has also 'give a covenant,' (40 xxv), but never 'cut a covenant,' as *always* elsewhere in Genesis, xv.18, xxi.27,32, xxvi.28, xxxi.44.

*(xiii) *v.*18, 'my (his) covenant,' vi.18, ix.9,11,12,13,15,16,17, xvii.2,4,7,9,10, 13,14,19,21, E.ii.24, vi.4,5.

*(xiv) *v.*18, 'with (אֵת) thee,' 'with them,' &c. used as a kind of expletive, vi.18,19, vii.7,13, viii.16,17,17,18, ix.8,10,10, xi.31, xvii.27, xxi.2, xxviii.4, xlvi.6,7,7.

*(xv) *v.*18, 'thou and thy sons and thy wife and thy sons' wives with thee,' viii.16;

*comp.* 'Noah and his sons and his wife and his sons' wives with him,' vii.7;

'Noah, and Shem, Ham, and Japheth, Noah's sons, and Noah's wife, and his sons' three wives with them,' vii.13;

'Jacob and all his seed with him, his sons and his sons' sons with him, his daughters and his sons' daughters and all his seed,' xlvi.6,7.

J has 'thou and thy sons and thy sons' sons,' xlv.10; but he nowhere uses the characteristic 'with him' of the Elohist.

*(xvi) *v.*19, 'every thing living out of all flesh';

*comp.* 'every living-thing . . . out of all flesh,' viii.17;

'every living soul among all flesh,' ix.15,16.

(xvii) *v.*19, 'male and female,' as in i.27, v.2: also J (vii.3).

*(xviii) *v.*20,20,20, 'after his kind,' (1.i).

*(xix) *v.*20, 'all creeping-things of the ground,' (1.vi).

*(xx) *v.*21, אָכְלָה, 'food,' (1.viii).

20. vi.15,16, *Jehovist.*

Both HUPFELD and BOEHMER give this whole section, *v.*9-22, to E. But in (IV.47) I have given my reasons for assigning these verses to the Jehovist, as follows:—

These verses appear to be *Jehovistic*, since E seems to have completed *his* directions for the making of the Ark in *v.*14, 'Make it of cypress-wood, make it in cells, pitch it within and without with pitch,'—after which begins a fresh set of instructions, 'And this is how thou shalt make it, &c.' These last words *might* be understood to mean, 'This is how thou shalt settle the dimensions of the Ark.' But after this follow the directions for a 'light' and a 'door,' which are thus separated from the other (*Elohistic*) detail in *v.*14, 'make it in cells.' Also the *preciseness* of these instructions in *v.*15,16, corresponds much more with the style of J than with that of E.

To the above conclusion, I feel obliged still to adhere. There is no part of E, as far as we shall here be able to examine it,—up to E.vi.7,—which corresponds in any respect with the precise directions here given for the length, breadth, and height of the Ark: whereas in E.xxv, &c. we have a series

of very copious directions of the very same kind, which must, it would seem, have come from the same author as G.vi.15,16.

21. Prof. HUPFELD, indeed, writes to me:—

The fact of vi.15,16 being Elohistic is supported by the analogy of E.xxv, &c.

But this assumes that E.xxv, &c. is certainly Elohistic, which appears to me at present exceedingly doubtful. And, indeed, when we consider the extreme *brevity* of the E notices in the first nineteen chapters of Exodus,—as shown by Prof. HUPFELD'S own list, agreeing substantially with our own, quoted in chap.ii —it must seem strange that this writer should have suddenly launched out into such very full descriptions of the Tabernacle, and its appurtenances. But this must seem still more surprising and improbable, when it is observed that throughout the whole Book of Genesis he makes not the least allusion to any formal *priests, altars,* or *sacrifices.*

For the present, therefore, at all events—and until the whole Book of Exodus has been submitted to a close critical examination, such as HUPFELD and BOEHMER have applied to the Book of Genesis,—we must rather suppose that E.xxv, &c., and therefore also G.vi.15,16, do *not* belong to the Elohist. This view seems to be confirmed to some extent by the arguments above alleged, as well as by the circumstance that the only notice of the 'door' and the 'window,' which are introduced in *v.*16, occurs in vii.16$^{b}$, viii.6, both Jehovistic passages; and possibly the obscure direction in *v.*16, 'in a cubit shalt thou finish it upward,' may refer to the '*covering* of the Ark,' which J again makes Noah remove in viii.13$^{b}$. It may be noted also that מָקוֹם, 'place,' which is used in vi.16, occurs nowhere in E, (unless it be in this passage,) but *forty-six* times in the rest of Genesis. See also (32.vii) below.

22. vii.1–5, *Jehovist.*

*(i) *v.*1, 'thou and all thy house':
*comp.* 'Pharaoh and his house,' xii.17;
'I and my house,' xxxiv.30;

'thou and thy house,' xlv. 11;
'his father and all his father's house,' xlvii.12;
also 'he and all the people that were with him,' xxxv.6;
'he and his brethren and all that went up with him,' l.14;
'he and his father's house,' l.22.

and contrast the E expressions (19.xv).

(ii) *v.*1, 'the Ark,' referring to vi.14,19 in the Elohistic story.

(iii) *v.*2, 'thou shalt *take* to thee':

*contr.* the E. expression, vi.20, 'they shall *come* unto thee,' *i.e.* come of themselves, whereas Noah is to 'take' of the *food* and 'gather' it 'to him,' vi.21.

(iv) *v.*2, 'the man and his woman'=the male and his mate:

E has 'male and female,' i.27, v.2, vi.19, which J has also in vii.3.

*(v) *v.*4, מָחָה, 'wipe-out,' (13.ix).

*(vi) *v.*4, '*I will wipe-out* all the substance, *which I have* made, *from off the face of the ground*';

*comp.* '*I will wipe-out* man, *whom I have* created, *from off the face of the ground*,' vi.7.

*(vii) *v.*4, 'from off the face of the ground,' as in iv.14, vi.7.

*(viii) *v.*4, 'face of the ground,' (3.iii).

## 23. vii.6–9, *Elohist.*

We suppose that *v.*6 followed originally after vi.22.

(i) *v.*6, 'and Noah was a son of 600 years,' refers to v.32.

(ii) *v.*6, Noah's age at the beginning of the Flood (10.vii).

(iii) *v.*6, 'flood of waters,' as in vi.17.

*(iv) *v.*7, 'and he went, Noah, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives, with him, into the Ark';

*comp.* 'and thou shalt go, thou and thy sons, and thy wife, and thy sons' wives with thee, into the Ark,' vi.18.

*(v) *v.*7, 'Noah and his sons, &c.;' *comp.* the E. expressions (19.xv).

*(vi) *v.*7, 'with (אֵת) him,' used as an expletive (19.xiv).

*(vii) *v.*8, 'out of the cattle, &c. two, two, they came unto Noah';

*comp.* 'out of the fowl, &c. two out of all shall come unto thee,' vi.20.

*(viii) *v.*8, 'cattle, fowl, all that creepeth upon the ground';

*comp.* 'fowl, cattle, all creeping-things of the ground,' the same three classes of creatures, vi.20.

*(ix) *v.*8, 'all that creepeth upon the ground,' (1.vi.)

(x) *v.*9, 'two, two,' *comp.* 'two out of all,' vi.19,20.

(xi) *v.*9, 'they *came* unto Noah,' *comp.* 'they shall *come* unto thee,' vi.20, and *contr.* 'thou shalt *take* to thee,' vii.2 (J).

(xii) *v.*9, 'male and female,' as in i.27, v.2, vi.19.

(xiii) *v.*9, 'as Elohim commanded Noah,' refers to vi.19,20.

24. In Part IV, as here, I have assigned the whole of the above section to the Jehovist, noting as follows (50.xi.N.B.):—

HUPFELD, *p.*7, considers that *v.*8[a] is Jehovistic, as referring to the mention of 'clean' and 'unclean' animals in *v.*2, whereas E makes no such distinction in vi.20. But such distinctions may have existed independently of the Levitical Law, (as in fact, they exist among many uncivilised nations,) and therefore these words *may* belong to E, whenever he lived. It may be noticed also that the Hebrew phrase here used for unclean (אֵינֶנָּה טְהֹרָה) differs from that used *immediately* before in *v.*2 (לֹא טְהֹרָה),—a fact which rather points to a difference of authorship. It would seem that *v.*8,9, describes complete obedience to the command in vi.19,20.

BOEHMER agrees in the above view, writing as follows, *p.*22:—

HUPFELD, *p.*7, &c. thinks that *v.*7–9, (besides its containing the formula of the Jehovist, 'of clean beasts and of beasts not clean,' *v.*8,) cannot be purely Elohistic for this reason, that in *v.*13–16[a] all this statement in *v.*6–9 is verbally repeated, and, in E's view, could only have taken place after the Flood had begun. But *v.*11,13, &c. only tells us that Noah's entrance into the Ark took place *on the same day* that the Flood began,—not that it took place *after the beginning* of the Flood. Hence it is left possible that the entrance into the Ark may have been recorded [by E] before, and only repeated in *v.*13. And, when we look at the diffuse style of this writer in [i], xvii, xxiii, there is nothing to surprise us in such a repetition. This diffuseness would lead naturally to the mention of the division into 'clean' and 'unclean,' both classes, however, being here treated alike, that is, only *one* pair of *each* kind entering, not *seven* pairs of *clean* as in vii.2. Nothing, however, is lost for the Jehovist, if we ascribe these verses wholly to E. For, after the mention in *v.*5 of the obedience to the divine command, 'and Noah did according to all that Jehovah commanded him,' it might follow, as in *v.*16[b], 'and Jehovah shut after him,' without its being necessary, as HUPFELD supposes, that a further notice should be given of Noah's actually going in. We do not, therefore, think it necessary with HUPFELD to assume in *v.*7–9 a mixture of E. and J. matter, interpolated also by the Compiler; but we leave *all* for E, until further reasons are alleged against it.

25. BOEHMER, it will be observed, brings *v.*16[b] immediately after *v.*5, so placing it *before* *v.*10,12, which he also regards with us as Jehovistic. He does this, in order to maintain the view, which he shares with HUPFELD, as to the *independence* and original *completeness* of the J document. But if, as we believe, the Jehovist merely wrote to *supplement* what already lay before him, no such displacement would be necessary.

### 26. vii.10, *Jehovist.*

'it came-to-pass after the seven days, that the waters of the Flood were upon the earth';

*comp.* 'after yet seven days I will cause-it-to-rain upon the earth,' vii.4.

### 27. vii.11, *Elohist.*

(i) 'in the 600th year of Noah's life,' refers to vii.6.

(ii) Noah's age at the beginning of the Flood (10.vii).

*(iii) 'in the second month, in the seventeenth day of the month';

*comp.* 'in the seventh month, in the seventeenth day of the month,' viii.4ᵇ;

'in the tenth, in the first of the month,' viii.5;

'in the first, in the first of the month,' viii.13ᵃ;

'in the second month, in the twenty-seventh day of the month,' viii.14.

(iv) "the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened';

*comp.* the idea of the waters *beneath*, and the waters *above*, the firmament, i.6,7.

(v) תְּהוֹם, 'deep,' as in i.2.

### 28. vii.12, *Jehovist.*

'and the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights';

*comp.* 'I will cause-it-to-rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights,' vii.4.

N.B. This Jehovistic statement of the forty days' rain is here inserted awkwardly, out of its proper place in the story. In *v.*17, which is also Jehovistic, it is introduced more suitably to the context before and after, when Noah and his family have already entered the Ark, *v.*13–16. But both *v.*10 and *v.*12 interrupt the continuity of the narrative.

### 29. vii.13–16ᵃ, *Elohist.*

*(i) *v.*13, 'in the bone of this day'=on that self-same day, vii.13,xvii.23,26.

*(ii) *v.*13, 'Noah, and Shem and Ham and Japheth, Noah's wife, and his sons' three wives with them,' (19.xv).

*(iii) *v.*13, 'with (אֵת) them,' as an expletive (19.xiv).

*(iv) *v.*14,14,14, 'after its kind,' (1.i).

*(v) *v.*14, 'every creeping-thing that creepeth upon the earth,' (1.vii).

(vi) *v.*15, 'they came unto Noah into the Ark,' as in vii.9(23.xi).

(vii) *v.*15, 'two, two,' as in vii.9; *comp.*vi.19,20.

*(viii) *v.*15,16, 'all flesh,' (19.viii).

(ix) *v.*15, 'all flesh in which is a spirit of life,' as in vi.17;

*comp.* 'all in which is a living soul,' i.30.

(x) *v.*16ᵃ, 'male and female,' as in i.27,v.2,vi.19,vii.9.

N.B. *v.*16ᵃ, 'as Elohim commanded him,' closed this E. section, as in vi.22, vii.9.

30. In *v.*13 we read,—

'*On that self-same day* went Noah, &c. into the Ark,'—

*i.e.* on the same day on which—

'the fountains of the great deep were broken up, &c.,' *v.*11,

and the Flood began; whereas, according to the Jehovist, *v.*1,4,—

'Go thou and all thy house into the Ark . . . . for *yet seven days*, and I will cause-it-to-rain upon the earth,'—

Noah and his family were to go into the Ark, *seven days before* the Flood began. It cannot be replied that Noah was to go in a week before the Flood, and was to employ the interval in 'taking to him' the animals, *v.*2,3, so as to go in *finally* on the day when the Flood began; for *v.*14 says that the animals also went in, together with Noah, 'on that self-same day' on which the Flood began. On this point DELITZSCH writes, *p.*259:—

'On this same day, says *v.*13,—*viz.* on the first day of the forty, after the expiration of the seven appointed days—went Noah with his family into the Ark. The animals also, as is plain from *v.*14, went in on the same day of the beginning of the rain.'

But, as the story now stands, *v.*10, when compared with *v.*7–9, implies that Noah and the animals had been in the Ark seven days before the rain began.

31. vii.16$^{b}$,17, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*16$^{b}$, 'and Jehovah shut-up after him,' *strong anthropomorphism* (3.xx).

(ii) *v.*16$^{b}$ refers to the *door* provided in vi.16;

(iii) *v.*16$^{b}$, בַּעֲדוֹ, 'behind,' vii.16$^{b}$, xx.18, xxvi.8—also E$_{a}$(xx.7).

*(iv) *v.*17, 'and the Flood was 40 days upon the earth';

*comp.* 'and the rain was upon the earth 40 days,' vii.12.

(v) *v.*17, 'forty days' (the LXX adds 'and forty nights');

*comp.* the 'forty days and forty nights' of rain, vii.4,12.

N.B. E says vii.24, that 'the waters were mighty upon the earth 150 days;' and he evidently means that they went on increasing during all that time, since *after* this, according to him, viii.2, 'the fountains of the deep and the windows of heaven were stopped.' This shows conclusively that *v.*17$^{a}$, 'and the Flood was 40 days upon the earth,' must be due to the Jehovist.

32. vii.18–20, *Jehovist*, except *v.*18$^{a}$,19$^{b}$.

In (IV.57) I had assigned *v.*18[a],20[b], to E, with reference to which Prof. HUPFELD has kindly written to me as follows:—

'I approve your reason for giving vii.18[b],19[a], to the Jehovist—not *v.*19[b], *comp.* vi.17, but *v.*20[b]—not *v.*20[a];

so that HUPFELD now assigns *v.*18[a],19[b],20[a], to E.

I admit that *v.*19[b] belongs most probably to E. But I now assign *v.*20 *wholly* to the Jehovist, and reason upon the whole passage as follows:—

(i) *v.*18[a], 'and the waters were mighty and multiplied greatly upon the earth,' is *Elohistic*, since it contains the phrase גָּבַר וְרָבָה, 'be mighty and multiply,' which corresponds exactly, *mutatis mutandis*, (since '*fructify*' could not be used of '*the waters*') to the favourite E. formula, פָּרָה וְרָבָה, 'fructify and multiply,' (I.iv); *comp.* also וַיִּרְבּוּ מְאֹד, 'and they multiplied greatly,' as in xlvii.27[b].

(ii) *v.*18[b], 'and the Ark went upon the face of the waters,' is *Jehovistic*, since it describes a further stage of the action of the waters beyond that described by the *Jehovist* in *v.*17[b], *e.g.* 'and the waters multiplied, and they raised the Ark, and it was lifted from off the earth, *and the Ark went upon the face of the waters.*'

(iii) *v.*19[a] is *Jehovistic*, since it contains מְאֹד מְאֹד, 'very, very,' as in xxx.43; whereas E uses בִּמְאֹד מְאֹד, xvii.2,6,20, E.i.7.

(iv) *v.*19[b] is *Elohistic*, since it contains 'under all the heaven;' *comp.* 'from under the heaven,' vi.17.

(v) *v.*20[b], 'and the mountains were covered,' is *Jehovistic*, since it would be a tame and spiritless repetition, if written by E after *v.*19[b], *e.g.* 'and all the high mountains, that were under all the heaven, were covered . . . . *and the mountains were covered.*'

(vi) *v.*20[a], 'fifteen cubits upwards the waters were mighty,' is *Jehovistic*, because it seems to describe a still further stage of the action of the waters: they swelled so as to be 15 cubits above the highest mountains, so that the Ark, which was 30 cubits high, vi.15, and was probably supposed to be floating half below the water, was now lifted high above the earth, and, when driven by the wind, would just graze the mountain-summits, and ground at once, as soon as the waters began to fall, as the *Jehovist* tells us it did, 'upon the mountains of Ararat,' viii.4[ac].

(vii) *v.*20[a] contains also the measurement '15 cubits,' *comp.* '300 cubits, 50 cubits, 30 cubits,' vi.15, 'a cubit,' vi.16,—and 'upwards,' as in vi.16. But we use this rather to confirm our view that vi.15,16, is *Jehovistic*, than as a proof that vii.20[a] is, which last conclusion is based independently on the reasoning in (vi).

N.B. It appears to us that in *v.*20 the Jehovist wishes to explain *to what extent* the effect described by E in *v.*19[b]—'and all the high mountains, that were under all the heaven, were covered'—was carried, with a view to the future grounding on Ararat; and so he inserts 'fifteen cubits upwards the waters were mighty, and the mountains were covered;' and that he has imitated the phrases, 'and the waters were mighty, very, very, upon the earth,' *v.*19[a], 'the waters were mighty,' *v.*20[a],

as well as 'and the mountains were covered,' *v.*20$^{b}$, from the expressions which he had before him in the E. narrative, 'and the waters were mighty . . . very upon the earth,' *v.*18$^{a}$, 'and all the high mountains . . . were covered,' *v.*19$^{b}$. In fact, it can hardly be supposed that the agreement in these expressions is *accidental*; and, if not, it seems to militate strongly against the theory that the Jehovist wrote an original independent document.

33. vii.21,22, *Elohist.*

*(i) *v.*21, 'all flesh,' (19.viii).

*(ii) *v.*21, גָּוַע, 'expire,' (19.xi).

*(iii) *v.*21, 'that creepeth upon the earth,' (1.vii).

*(iv) *v.*21, 'swarm,' 'swarming-things,' (1.ii).

*(v) *v.*22, 'all out of all,' as in vi.19,viii.17,ix.10.

N.B. The word for 'dry land' in vii.22 is חָרָבָה, which differs from that in i.9,10, יַבָּשָׁה: but neither of these occurs again in Genesis; and the verb חָרַב 'be dried-up,' occurs in viii.13$^{a}$(E),13$^{b}$(J),and יָבֵשׁ, in viii.14(E), viii.7(J).

34. BOEHMER assigns *v.*22, as I had done in (IV.59), to the Jehovist, and writes, *p.*83 :—

'vii.22 must be ascribed, not with HUPFELD, *p.*81, to A(E), but with DELITZSCH, who reminds us of ii.7, to B(J).'

But the expression in vii.22, '*all in whose nostrils was the breath of a spirit of life*,' agrees as nearly with the E. phrase twice used, '*all* flesh *in which was a spirit of life*,' vi.17, vii.15, as it does with the J. language, 'He breathed *in his nostrils the breath of life*,' ii.7. And the forms of the Hebrew verbs at the *beginning* of *v.*21 and the *end* of *v.*22 correspond exactly to those which would have been used, if one and the same writer had written both verses, *comp.* וַיָּבֹאוּ, 'and they came,' at the beginning of vii.15, with בָּאוּ, 'they came,' at the end of the same context in vii.16$^{a}$.

35. vii.23$^{a}$, *Jehovist.*

*(i) 'And he wiped-out all the substance that was upon the face of the ground, from man unto cattle, unto creeping-thing, and unto fowl of the heaven,' (22.vi);

*(ii) מָחָה, 'wipe-out'=destroy, (13.ix).

*(iii) יְקוּם, 'substance,' as in vii.4.

*(iv) 'face of the ground,' (3.iii).

*(v) 'from man unto beast,' (13.xi).

36. vii.23$^{b}$,24, *Elohist.*

HUPFELD and BOEHMER both assign *v.*23$^{b}$ to the Jehovist; but it seems to be due to E.

(i) *v.*23$^{b}$, 'Noah and what was with him in the Ark':
*comp.* 'Noah and . . . what was with him in the Ark,' viii.1.
(ii) *v.*24, 'and the waters were mighty,' as in vii.18$^{a}$.
*(iii) *v.*24, מְאַת, 'hundred,' (10.ix).
*(iv) *v.*24, 150 days, as in viii.3$^{b}$; see (37.x).

37. viii.1–5, *Elohist*, except *v.*2$^{b}$,3$^{a}$,4$^{ac}$.

*(i) *v.*1, 'and Elohim remembered Noah';
*comp.* 'and Elohim remembered Abraham (Rachel), xix.29,xxx.22;
*comp.* also ix.16,E.ii.24,vi.5.
(ii) *v.*1, 'all the animals and all the cattle,' *comp.*vii.14.
(iii) *v.*1, 'Noah and . . . what was with him in the Ark,' *comp.*vii.23$^{b}$.
*(iv) *v.*1, 'every animal . . . that was with him';
*comp.* 'every animal that is with thee,' viii.17;
'every living soul that is with you,' ix.10,12;
'every animal of the earth with you,' ix.10.
*(v) *v.*2$^{a}$, 'the fountains of the deep,' 'the windows of heaven,' as in vii.11.
(vi) *v.*2$^{a}$, תְּהוֹם, 'deep,' as in i.2,vii.11.
*(vii) *v.*3$^{b}$, 'and the waters abated after the end of 150 days';
*comp.* 'and the waters were mighty upon the earth 150 days,' vii.24.
*(viii) *v.*3$^{b}$, מְאַת, 'hundred,' (10.ix).
*(ix) *v.*4$^{b}$, 'in the seventh month, in the seventeenth day of the month,' (27.iii).
(x) *v.*3$^{b}$,4$^{b}$, 'and the waters abated after the end of 150 days, in the 7th month, in the 17th day of the month,' agrees with the other E data; since 150 days (during which 'the waters were mighty,' vii.24, and after which their increase was stopped, viii.2$^{a}$)=5 months, which added to the date of the commencement of the Flood, 2mo. 17d. (vii.11), gives us 7mo. 17d. (viii.3$^{b}$4$^{b}$), as the date of the waters beginning to abate.
(xi) *v.*5, חָסַר, 'abate,' as in *v.*3$^{b}$.
*(xii) *v.*5, 'in the tenth, in the first of the month,' (27.iii).
*(xiii) *v.*5, 'the tops of the mountains were seen';
*comp.* 'all the high mountains . . . were covered,' vii.19$^{b}$.

N.B. According to E the mountain-tops were first seen on the 1st day of the 10th month, *v.*5; but as the story now stands, 'on the 17th day of the 7th month,' *v.*4$^{b}$(E), *i.e.* 73 days before, 'the Ark settled on the mountains of Ararat,' *v.*4$^{ac}$(J).

38. viii.2$^{b}$,3$^{a}$,4$^{ac}$, *Jehovistic.*

In (IV.62) I assigned *v.*3$^{a}$ to E; but I now assent to the judgment of HUPFELD and BOEHMER for the reasons below.

(i) *v.*2[b] refers to the 'rain' in vii.4,12, of which no mention is made in vii.11(E): in fact, the two parts of the combined statement in *v.*2, as it now stands, 'the windows of heaven were stopped (E), and the rain was restrained out of heaven (J),' correspond exactly to those of the combined statement in vii.11,12, 'the windows of heaven were opened (E), and the rain was upon the earth (J).'

(ii) *v.*3[a], 'and the waters returned from off the earth, returning continually,' is *superfluous* before the more distinct data of E, 'and the waters abated after 150 days,' *v.*3[b], 'and the waters abated continually until the tenth month &c.,' *v.*5.

(iii) *v.*3[a] is even *contradictory* to *v.*3[b], since E gives in the latter the date of the very *commencement* of the abatement, 'after the end of the 150 days'; whereas *v.*3[a] has already implied a long progress of that abatement.

(iv) *v.*3[b],5, both contain חָסַר, 'abate,' not שׁוּב, 'return,' which is used in *v.*3[a], and is properly still more expressive of the regression and decrease of the waters.

(v) In *v.*1, where E says, 'the waters *assuaged* (שָׁכַךְ),' the idea expressed is not that of a diminution of the waters, as if they had already begun to abate, but only of their *tumultuous swelling* being allayed, *comp.* N.xvii.5(20), Est.ii.1, vii.10: which was effected by a wind being made to pass over the surface, viii.1,—not for the purpose of *drying-up* the waters, but merely to calm and *still* them,—while the floods were no longer poured-up from the 'fountains of the deep,' or poured-down from the 'windows of heaven,' viii.2[a].

N.B. In *v.*3[a] we have 'going and returning' = returning continually, which idiom J uses in viii.3[a],7, xii.9, xxvi.13: but E also uses it in viii.5.

39. BOEHMER assigns *v.*4[a], 'and the Ark rested,' to E, as I had done in (IV.61). I assent now, however, to the view of HUPFELD, who believes that only the note of time in *v.*4, viz. *v.*4[b], belongs to E, in continuation with *v.*3[b],—

'and at the end of 150 days the waters abated, in the 7th month, in the 17th day of the month.'

I now, therefore, assign *v.*4[ac] to J, for the following reasons:—

(i) The datum in *v.*4[b], 'the 17th day of the 7th month,' seems only meant to intimate the day on which the waters *began to abate* at the end of (150 days, vii.24, viii.3[b], =) 5 months from the '17th day of the 2nd month,' vii.11, when the waters *began to rise.*

(ii) E can hardly have supposed the Ark to have settled on 'the 17th day of the 7th month,' the very *first* day of the abatement, on the 'mountains of Ararat,' since he says that the 'tops of the mountains' were not visible till the '1st day of the 10th month,' 73 days afterwards, viii.5, and makes an interval of 3 months more, viii.13, or 90 days to the next stage of abatement, when the earth was dried.

(iii) It is very unlikely that E allowed the Ark to settle on the top of Ararat, from which Noah and the animals would have to descend into the plain,—especially as no hint is given by him of any such descent in viii.16–20, when he speaks only of their 'going forth' out of the Ark.

(iv) The notice in question is only one of a series, which have been already assigned to J, about the movements of the Ark;—

'and the waters increased, and bare up the Ark, and it was lifted from off the earth,' vii.17$^{b}$;

'and the Ark went upon the face of the waters,' vii.18$^{b}$;

'and the Ark settled upon the mountains of Ararat,' viii.4$^{ac}$.

(v) I have assigned vii.20$^{a}$ to the same writer (32.vi), and suppose him to have meant to imply that—since the Flood reached 15 cubits above the top of Ararat—the Ark, which was 30 cubits high and may have been supposed to float half below the water, might be imagined to drift over the mountain-tops, and so just ground upon the summit of Ararat, as soon as the waters *began* to fall, *i.e.* according to the E. datum, *v.*4$^{b}$, 'on the 17th day of the 7th month.' This also seems to connect viii.4$^{c}$ with vii.20$^{b}$, and *both* with vi.15,16, and *all* with the *Jehovist.*

*(vi) *v.*4$^{a}$, נוּחַ, 'settle,' *comp.* הֲנָיוֹת, 'put-down,' (3.xi).

(vii) *v.*4$^{c}$, 'the mountains of Ararat:' *comp.* the geographical knowledge shewn by the Jehovist (3.vii).

## 40. viii.6–12, *Jehovist.*

*(i) *v.*6, 'forty days,' as in vii.4,12,17.

*(ii) *v.*6,10,12, E mentions only the *day, month,* and *year,* of the most notable events of the Flood, vii.6,11,viii.4,5,13,14; whereas J marks the stages of its progress by 'seven days' and 'forty days.'

(iii) *v.*6, 'Noah opened the window (חַלּוֹן) of the Ark which he had made,' refers to the 'light' (צֹהַר), vi.16, since it speaks of the 'window *which he had made*';

*comp.* the references to the 'door' and 'roof' of vi.16, which occur in vii.16$^{b}$, viii.13$^{b}$,—all which seem to indicate that vi.15,16 is Jehovistic, as we suppose.

(iv) *v.*7,11, 'from off the earth,' as in vii.17: also E(viii.13).

(v) *v.*8, '*to see* if the waters were lightened, &c.';

*comp.* '*to see* what he would call them,' ii.19.

(vi) *v.*8, 'from off the face of the ground,' as in iv.14, vi.7, vii.4.

*(vii) *v.*8, 'face of the ground,' (3.iii).

(viii) *v.*9, 'upon the face of all the earth,' as in vii.3: also E (i.29).

(ix) *v.*9, 'and he put forth his hand, . . . and brought it unto him into the Ark';

*comp.* 'and they put forth their hand, and brought Lot unto them into the house,' xix.10.

(x) *v.*10,12, 'seven days,' as in vii.4,10.

*(xi) *v.*10,12,12, 'add to put forth,' 'add to return,' (5.iv).

41. In *v.*7,8, we have '*the* raven,' '*the* dove'; and it has been argued that this passage must be due to E, since *he* only speaks of a *single* pair of doves, and here, apparently, names the one male bird; but *comp.* '*the* serpent,' iii.1, '*the* garment,'

ix.23, '*the* bush,' E.iii.2, in each of which passages the article is similarly used with a noun which has not been named before. The article *may* express the *well-known* 'raven,' &c. of the legend, or the raven 'which was there,' '*which he had at hand*,' &c.

As the story now stands, however, this J. passage introduces a great inconsistency. Between the time when 'the tops of the mountains were seen,' *v.*5, on the 1st day of the *tenth* month, and the time when 'the waters were dried-up from off the earth,' *v.*13, on the first day of the *first* month (of the next year), there would be an interval of three months = 90 days. If we deduct the 40 days of waiting, *v.*6, we have 50 days remaining for sending out the raven and the dove: whereas the account, as it now stands, plainly implies an interval of 7 days only between each sending, to which might, perhaps, be added 7 days more after the dove was sent out the second time,—making only 21 days altogether.

The necessity for sending out these birds at all arises from the J. notice that 'the Ark had settled on the mountains of Ararat,' and may be explained by supposing that, by reason either of the *size*, or *situation*, or *construction* of the window, or because of the high position of the Ark, Noah could not see for himself what was passing on the plains below.

But why did not *all* the birds *fly away*, since the Ark lay *uncovered* for *two months* (43.ii), before they went out of the Ark with Noah?

42. viii.13-19, *Elohist*, except *v.*13$^{b}$.

*(i) *v.*13$^{a}$, 'in the 600th year' refers to vii.11, *comp.* v.32, vii.6.

*(ii) *v.*13$^{a}$, 'in the first, in the first of the month,' *v.*14, 'in the second month, in the twenty-seventh day of the month,' (27.iii).

*(iii) *v.*16, 'thou, and thy wife, &c.' *v.*18, 'Noah and his wife, &c.,' (19.xv).

*(iv) *v.*16, 'with (אִתְּ) thee,' *v.*18, 'with him,' as an expletive (19.xiv).

*(v) *v.*17, 'every living-thing . . . out of all flesh,' (19.xvi);
*comp.* 'everything that liveth out of all flesh,' vi.19.

*(vi) *v.*17, 'all flesh,' (19.viii).

(vii) *v.*17, 'among fowl and among cattle,' as in vii.21.

*(viii) *v.*17, 'every creeping-thing that creepeth upon the earth,' (1.vii).

*(ix) *v.*17, שֶׁרֶץ, 'swarm,' (1.ii).

*(x) *v.*17, פְּרָה וְרִבָּה, 'fructify and multiply,' (1.iv).

*(xi) *v.*19, 'everything creeping upon the earth,' as in i.30, (1.vii).

43. viii.13$^{b}$, *Jehovist.*

Both HUPFELD and BOEHMER give this to E: I assign it to J for the following reasons.

*(i) 'face of the ground,' (3.iii).

(ii) The statement here made—'and Noah removed the covering of the Ark, and saw, and behold! the face of the ground was dried-up'—is inconsistent with the E. data in *v.*14–19, since it makes the Ark lie *uncovered* nearly *two months* before Noah and his family and the multitude of animals came out of it, *v.*18,19, though according to E, *v.*13$^{a}$, the waters were already '*dried-up* from off the earth,' and the creatures, therefore,—the birds at all events, like the dove, *v.*12—might have been let out to seek fresh food, which they must have greatly needed after their long confinement; nay, the birds, when the roof was off, might be expected to fly away.

(iii) This 'removal of the *covering* of the Ark' is probably introduced—like the references to the 'door' and 'window,' vii.16$^{b}$, viii.6—in allusion to the otherwise obscure direction, 'in a cubit shalt thou finish it upward,' vi.16, by the J. writer, to whom (as we suppose) the precise artistic directions in vi.15,16 belong.

(iv) Probably the חָרַב, 'be dried-up,' of *v.*13$^{b}$ has been taken up by the Jehovist from the preceding E. words in *v.*13$^{a}$.

*(v) סוּר, 'turn aside' is here used, which is used nowhere by E, but occurs with J in viii.13$^{b}$, xix.2,3,xxx.32,35,xxxv.2, xxxviii.14,19,xli.42,xlviii.17,xlix.10.

44. The later *ecclesiastical* year began in the *Spring.* But in the older time the 'Feast of Ingathering' was held 'in the *end* of the year,' E.xxiii.16, so that the new year began in *Autumn.* It is probable that the more ancient reckoning is observed in this account of the Flood, which in that case began, according to the story, about the middle of the *second* month, vii.11, *i.e.* about the beginning of *November*, and lasted over the five wet and stormy winter months, vii.24, viii.3, till the bright days of Spring came round, and 'the waters were dried-up from off the earth' during the heat of Summer. Accordingly, the name *Bul* (בּוּל), 1K.vi.38, of the *second*—after-

wards *eighth*—month is derived from the same root יָבַל, 'flow as rain,' as מַבּוּל, the word used throughout for 'Deluge.'

But then the herbivorous animals coming out of the Ark in the *second* month (November), viii.14, would find no supplies of fresh food till the spring.

45. viii.20–22, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*20, these 'sacrifices' require the 'seven'-pairs of clean animals provided by the Jehovist in vii.2,3, to which also the expression 'clean cattle' here refers.

*(ii) *v.*20, 'build an altar to Jehovah,' viii.20,xii.7,8,xiii.18,xxvi.25;

*comp.* 'make an altar,' xiii.4,xxxv.1,3, 'set up an altar,' xxxiii.20, 'build an altar,' xxii.9,xxxv.7.

(iii) *v.*21, 'Jehovah smelled the sweet savour,' strong *anthropomorphism* (3.xx).

(iv) *v.*21, 'Jehovah said unto His heart, I will not add again,' &c.;

*comp.* similar secret speeches ascribed to Jehovah, (3.xii).

(v) *v.*21, 'said unto his heart,' *comp.* 'speak unto my heart,' xxiv.45, 'said in his heart,' xxvii.41; also E (xvii.17).

(vi) *v.*21, Jehovah's 'heart,' as in vi.6.

*(vii) *v.*21, 'add to curse,' 'add to smite,' (5.iv).

*(viii) *v.*21, 'curse the ground for man's sake,' *comp.* iii.17,v.29.

*(ix) *v.*21, 'curse the ground': *comp.* the curses in (4.xiv).

*(x) *v.*21, בַּעֲבוּר, 'for the sake of,' (4.xviii).

*(xi) *v.*21, 'the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth,' as in vi.5.

*(xii) *v.*21, יֵצֶר, 'formation,' (3.v).

(xiii) *v.*21, הִכָּה, 'smite,' (5.xxi).

*(xiv) *v.*21, כָּל־חָי, 'all living,' as in iii.20.

*(xv) *v.*22, 'all the days,' (4.xv).

46. ix.1–17, *Elohist.*

(i) *v.*1, 'and Elohim blessed Noah and his sons,' (1.v).

*(ii) *v.*1,7, פְּרָה וְרִבָּה, 'fructify and multiply,' (1.iv).

*(iii) *v.*1, 'fructify and multiply and fill the earth,' as in i.28.

*(iv) *v.*2, 'the fear of you and the terror of you shall be upon every animal of the earth, &c.,' 'into your hand they are given';

*comp.* the 'dominion' over fish, fowl, &c., given to man, in i.26,28.

*(v) *v.*2,10,10, 'every animal of the earth,' (1.ix).

*(vi) *v.*2, 'all that creepeth the ground,' (1.vi).

(vii) *v.*2, 'fishes of the sea,' as in i.26,28.

(viii) *v.*3, 'every creeping-thing that liveth';

*comp.* 'every living-thing that creepeth,' i.21.

*(ix) *v.*3, אֹכְלָה, 'food,' (1.viii).

*(x) *v.*3, 'to you it shall be for food,' as in i.29.

*(xi) *v.*3, 'green herb,' as in i.30.

*(xii) *v.*6, 'in the image of Elohim made He man,' as in i.27.

*(xiii) *v.*7, שָׁרַץ, 'swarm,' (1.ii).

*(xiv) *v.*8, 'with (אֶת) him,' *v.*10,10, with you,' (19.xiv).

(xv) אֲנִי, 'I,' (19.ix).

*(xvi) *v.*9,11,17, 'establish a covenant,' (19.xii).

*(xvii) *v.*9,11,15, 'my covenant,' (19.xiii).

*(xviii) *v.*9, 'with you and with your seed after you';

*comp.* 'between thee and between thy seed after thee,' xvii.7;

'to thee and to thy seed after thee,' xvii.7,8,xxxv.12;

'thou and thy seed after thee,' xvii.9;

'between you and between thy seed after thee,' xvii.10;

'with him, to his seed after him,' xvii.19;

'to thee and to thy seed with thee,' xxviii.4;

'Jacob and all his seed with him,' xlvi.6;

'thy seed after thee,' xlviii.4.

N.B. In other parts of Genesis we find 'to thy seed,' xii.7,xv.18,xxiv.7,xxvi.4,—'to thee and to thy seed for ever,' xiii.15;—'to thee and to thy seed,' xxvi.3,xxviii.13,—but never 'thy seed *after* thee,' or 'thy seed *with* thee.'

*(xix) *v.*10,12,15,16, 'every living soul,' as in i.21.

*(xx) *v.*10,12, 'every living soul that is with you,' 'every animal of the earth with you,' (37.iv).

(xxi) *v.*10, 'among fowl and among cattle,' vii.21,viii.17,ix.10.

*(xxii) *v.*11,15,15,16,17, 'all flesh,' (19.viii).

(xxiii) *v.*11, 'waters of the Flood,' as in vii.7(E): also vii.10(J).

*(xxiv) *v.*11,15, שְׁחַת 'corrupt' = destroy, used by E throughout the story of the Flood (19.vi).

*(xxv) *v.*12, 'give a covenant,' ix.12,xvii.2,(19.xii).

(xxvi) *v.*12, 'everlasting generations';

*comp.* 'everlasting covenant,' ix.16,xvii.7,13,19;

'everlasting possession,' xvii.8,xlviii.4.

J has also 'everlasting Elohim,' xxi.33, 'everlasting mountains,' xlix.26.

*(xxvii) *v.*15,16, 'every living soul among all flesh';

*comp.* 'every living thing out of all flesh,' (19.xvi).

(xxviii) *v.*16, 'to remember the everlasting covenant,' (37.i).

## 47. ix.18–27, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*1, 'and Ham—he was the father of Canaan,' as in *v.*22, and evidently meant to introduce the narrative, *v.*20–27.

(ii) *v.*19, 'out of these was spread-abroad all the earth';

*comp.* 'out of these were separated the isles of the nations,' x.5;

'out of these were separated the nations in the earth,' x.32.

(iii) *v.*19, 'the earth (=the inhabitants of the earth) was spread-abroad'; *comp.* 'the earth was divided,' x.25.

*(iv) *v.*19, פּוּץ, 'be spread-abroad,' ix.19, x.18, xi.4,8,9, xlix.7.

*(v) *v.*20, '*beginning* of the cultivation of the vine, (5.xxvii).

*(vi) *v.*20, הֵחֵל, *hekhel*, 'begun,' (5.xxix).

*(vii) *v.*23, שְׁמֻלָה, ix.23, xxxv.2, xxxvii.34, xli.14, xliv.13, xlv.22,22.

*(viii) *v.*24, 'younger (קָטָן) son,' xxvii.15,42;

*comp.* 'elder (גָּדוֹל) brother,' x.21, 'elder son,' xxvii.1,15,42, 'younger daughter,' xxix.18, 'younger brother,' xlii.15,20,34, xliii.29, xliv.23,26,26, xlviii.19, 'elder,' xxix.16, xliv.12, 'younger,' xxix.16, xlii.13,30, xliv.2,12:

*comp.* also בְּכִירָה, 'eldest,' xix.31,33,34,37, xxix.26, חָב, 'elder,' xxv.23, צָעִיר, צְעִירָה, 'younger,' xix.31,34,35,38, xxv.23, xxix.26, xliii.33, xlviii.14.

(ix) *v.*24, עָשָׂה לְ, 'do to,' ix.24,xii.18,xvi.6,xix.8,8,19,xxi.6,23.xxii.12, xxvi.10,29,xxvii.37,45,xxix.25,xxx.31,xxxi.12,xlii.25,28,l.12,—also $E_2$(xx.9,9,13).

*(x) *v.*25, 'cursed be Canaan'; *comp.* the curses (4.xiv).

(xi) *v.*25, '*servant* of *servants*,' *v.*26,27, 'and Canaan shall be his *servant*';

There is probably a play here on the name 'Canaan,' (כְּנַעַן), which is derived from כָּנַע, 'be low, be humble,' and means really the *low, coast country* = the 'lowlands,' or its inhabitants, in opposition to *Aram*, the high country, or *highlands*: and so says Aug. *Enarr. in Ps.* civ, § 7, *Op. Omn.* vi.*p.*501, 'Cur autem dicta sit terra 'Chanaan,' interpretatio hujus nominis aperit; 'Chanaan' quippe interpretatur 'humilis.' Comp. Jer. *de nom. Hebr. Op. Omn.* ii.*p.*6,13. Here, however, the J. writer applies the word in quite a different sense to the *person* 'Canaan,' in order to intimate that the Canaanites should be *subjected* both to Semitic and Japhetic lords: *comp.* D.ix.3, 'he shall *humble* them before thee,' Ju.iii.30, 'and Moab was *humbled* that day.'

So in *v.*27, the name 'Japheth' (יֶפֶת), is played upon, as if connected with the verb יַפְתְּ, 'he shall enlarge.'

*comp.* the indirect derivations in (3.iv).

*(xii) *v.*26, 'Jehovah, Elohim of Shem';

*comp.* 'Jehovah, Elohim of heaven and Elohim of earth,' xxiv.3;
'Jehovah, Elohim of heaven,' *v.*7;
'Jehovah, Elohim of Abraham my master,' *v.*12,27,42,48;
'I am the Elohim of Abraham thy father,' xxvi.24;
'Jehovah, thy Elohim,' xxvii.20;
'I am Jehovah, the Elohim of Abraham thy father and the Elohim of Isaac,' xxviii.13;
'the Elohim of my (your, &c.) father,' xxxi.5,29,42,53, xlvi.3,l.17;
'I am the EL of Bethel,' xxxi.13;
'the Elohim of Abraham and the Dread of Isaac,' xxxi.42;
'the Elohim of Abraham and the Elohim of Nahor,' xxxi.53;
'the Dread of his father Isaac,' xxxi.53;
'the Elohim of my father Abraham and the Elohim of my father Isaac, Jehovah,' xxxii.10;

'the Elohim of Israel,' xxxiii.20;
'the EL of Bethel,' xxxv.7;
'your Elohim and the Elohim of your father,' xliii.23;
'the Elohim of his father Isaac,' xlvi.1,3;
'the El of thy father,' xlix.25.

*(xiii) *v.*27, שָׁכַן, 'abide,' (4.xxvii).

48. We agree with HUPFELD in assigning the above section wholly to the Jehovist. BOEHMER, *p.*150–56, gives *v.*18[a],19, to the Jehovist, and *v.*18[b],20–27, to the later Compiler—for which, however, in our judgment, he gives no sufficient reasons.

He observes that in vi.10, vii.13, ix.18[a], x.1, the order is Shem, Ham, Japheth, which is merely reversed in the table of x.2–32,—in order to bring Shem into close connection with the following narrative: whereas in ix.24 *Ham* is spoken of as the 'younger'—*i.e. youngest*—son of Noah, (*comp.* 1S.xvii.14,) and, as Shem is twice named in this passage before Japheth, *v.*23,26,27, he was plainly regarded as the eldest, and so the order supposed by *this* writer was 'Shem, Japheth, Ham,'—which difference implies a difference of authorship.

*Ans.* (i) The 'Compiler,' according to BOEHMER, had before him the other statements—in which the order 'Shem, Ham, Japheth,' occurs invariably. It seems hard to suppose that he would venture, on his own responsibility, to contradict so positively the uniform tradition of the other writers.

(ii) Certainly, in 1S.xvii.14—*comp.*1S.xvi.11—the expression הַקָּטָן implies 'the youngest,'—as in G.x.21 הַגָּדוֹל implies, no doubt, 'the eldest'—'Shem, the *eldest* brother of Japheth.' But these words may also be used as *comparatives*, as they are in i.16, 'the greater light,' 'the lesser light'; and the reference in ix.24 may be to the fact that Shem was the *eldest* of the three brothers, on which fact a stress is plainly laid in x.21, so that the comparison is really made between *his* conduct and that of Ham the younger brother, (LXX. ὁ νεώτερος). It will be observed that the stress of the blessing is laid distinctly on *Shem*, *v.*26,27, as if he had had Japheth under his influence, and was himself the real actor in the matter, more especially if *v.*26,27, be rendered, as by *Targ. Onk.* &c., 'Blessed be Jehovah, the Elohim of Shem! and Canaan shall be servant to them. Elohim shall enlarge Japheth, but He (Elohim) shall dwell (*Targ. Onk.* 'make His Shechinah to dwell') in the tabernacles of Shem, and Canaan shall be servant to them.'

N.B. The verb שָׁכַן, 'dwell,' here employed, is that habitually used of Jehovah's *dwelling* 'in the midst of' Israel, E.xxv.8, xxix.45,46, N.xxxv.34, 1K.vi.13, &c., for which יָשַׁב is never employed; and though the latter word is used occasionally with reference to Jehovah's dwelling in the *Temple*, 2S.vii.6, 1K.viii.13, &c., it expresses more properly his settled abode in *Heaven*, 1K.viii.30,39,43,49, &c. Further, though the complete phrase 'dwell (שָׁכַן) in the *tents* of' Israel is not used anywhere of Jehovah, yet 'dwell (שָׁכַן) in the midst of the *camps* of' Israel occurs in N.v.3. In Job xi.14 we read 'let iniquity not *dwell* (שָׁכַן) *in thy tents*';

whereas in 1Ch.v.10 we have 'They made war with the Hagarites, who fell by their hand, and they *dwelt* (וַיֵּשְׁבוּ) *in their tents.*'

49. ix.28,29, *Elohist.*

These verses refer plainly to vii.6, and correspond exactly with the E. data in v.7,8, &c., except that no mention is made of Noah's 'begetting sons and daughters' after the Flood. It would seem that he was supposed to have had only three sons, 'Shem, Ham, and Japheth,' all born before the Flood; and, indeed, the Jehovist tells us, ix.19, that—

'these were the three sons of Noah, and out of them was the whole earth overspread.'

50. x.1–32, *Jehovist*, except *v.*8–12.

(i) *v.*1, 'and these are the generations of the *sons of Noah*';

No formula like this occurs among the E formula in (2.iii); and E would hardly have written this, inasmuch as he writes in xi.10, 'these are the generations of *Shem.*'

(ii) *v.*1, 'and there were born (יִוָּלְדוּ) to them sons';

*comp.* 'and there was born (יִוָּלֵד) to Enoch Irad,' iv.18.

(iii) *v.*1, 'after the Flood,' may be taken from ix.28 (E) just preceding.

*(iv) *v.*5, 'out of these were separated the isles of the nations,' (47.ii).

*(v) *v.*5,32, הִפְרִד, 'be separated,' (3.x).

(vi) *v.*5,20,31,32, *comp.* these summarising clauses at the end of the corresponding passages with ix.19.

*(vii) *v.*13,15,24,24,26, יָלַד, 'beget,' (5.xxvi).

*(viii) *v.*18, פּוּץ, 'be spread-abroad,' (47.iv).

*(ix) *v.*19, 'at thy going-to Gerar,' 'at thy going to Sodom,' *v.*30, 'at thy going to Sephar';

*comp.* 'at thy going to Zoar,' xiii.10, 'at thy going to Asshur,' xxv.18.

*(x) *v.*19, 'and the border of the Canaanite was from Zidon, at thy going to Gerar, unto Gaza,—at thy going to Sodom, &c. unto Lasha'; *v.*30, 'and their dwelling was from Mesha, at thy going to Sephar';

*comp.* 'and they abode from Havilah unto Shur, at thy going to Asshur,' xxv.18.

(xi) *v.*19, 'Sodom and Gomorrah,' x.19,xiii.10,xviii.20,xix.24,28, *comp.* 'Sodom,' xiii.12$^{b}$,13, xviii.16,22,26, xix.1,1,4,—also $J_2$ (xiv.2,8, &c.)

(xii) *v.*21, 'and to Shem—to him also there was born';

*comp.* 'and to Seth—to him also there was born,' iv.26.

*(xiii) *v.*21, 'elder brother,' (47.viii).

(xiv) *v.*21,25, יָלַד, 'be born,' as in iv.26, vi.1.

*(xv) *v.25*, 'the name of the one was Peleg (פֶּלֶג), *for* in his days the earth was divided (פָּלַג)'; direct derivation as in (3.xvi).

(xvi) *v.25*, 'the earth' used for its inhabitants as in ix.19.

*(xvii) *v.25*, 'in his days the earth was divided,' *v.32*, 'out of these were separated the nations in the earth,' (47.ii).

*(xviii) *v.30*, קֶדֶם, 'east,' (3.vi).

(xix) *comp.* the remarkable amount of geographical knowledge shown by the Jehovist in this chapter with the other instances quoted in (3.vii).

51. x.8–12, *Deuteronomist.*

On this passage I have written as follows in IV.366:—

'There is one point in respect of which there is an appearance of artificiality in the list of names in this chapter, *viz.* that there are exactly *seventy* national names given in this register, if we omit the passage about Nimrod, *v.*8–12, which has some appearance of being a later interpolation, whether by the same or another writer,—since five sons of Cush are given in *v.*7, and it is strange that the story should begin again, *v.*8, 'and Cush begat Nimrod,'—and which at all events is concerned with the acts of an individual person, and not with a tribe or people. The number 'seventy' may have reference to the 'seventy' souls of the House of Jacob, which came into Egypt, G.xlvi.27; *comp.* also D.xxxii.8, 'When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when He separated the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the people according to the *number* of the children of Israel.'

And I quoted also upon *v.*8–12 the opinion of Mr. BEVAN, *Smith's Dict. of the Bible*, *p.*545:—

It does not seem to have formed part of the original genealogical statement, but to be an interpolation of a later date. It is the only instance in which personal characteristics are attributed to any of the names mentioned. The proverbial expression, which it embodies, bespeaks its traditional and fragmentary character: and there is nothing to connect the passage either with what precedes or with what follows it.

52. HUPFELD, *p.*139,223, regards the passage, *v.*8–12, as—

a separate fragment, which has thrust itself into the genealogy, but is recognisable, both through contents and form, as a foreign element.

BOEHMER, *p.*157, gives to the Compiler only the words in *v.*8, 'he began to be a mighty one upon the earth,' with 'Japheth's elder brother,' *v.*21, and the notices 'each according to his tongue,' *v.*5, 'after their tongues,' *v.*20,31, which notices he supposes to be inserted as a preparation for the account of the dispersion of tongues in xi.1–9, (ascribing this to the same author,) and he would give to the Compiler also, *p.*158—

if any one prefers, the phrases *by their lands* and *according to their families*, *v.*5, 20,31, or even more.

He writes also, *p.*83:—

'There is no reason to ascribe *v.*8–12 wholly to the Compiler with HUPFELD. The interruption of the genealogy through the insertion of historical remarks lies, as is well known, in the plan of such lists. So in the case of Enoch, v.24, we have an account of his being taken to heaven. The Compiler found this passage already before him, and himself made an insertion in it. That it belongs to B(J) is confirmed by a consideration of the political relations, under which he wrote.

53. We cannot assent to BOEHMER's views, but believe (with HUPFELD) that the whole passage, *v.*8–12, betrays itself manifestly 'as a foreign element'; and we assign it—not partially, with BOEHMER, but—entirely to the later Compiler or, in our view, Editor, whom we regard as identical with the *Deuteronomist*. In fact, it appears to us to be one of his antiquarian notices (16–18), similar to that in vi.4. The following analysis may serve to confirm this view, and will show, at all events, that there is nothing in these verses *incongruous* with his style.

(i) The fact noticed above,—that without Nimrod there are just 70 national names given in this chapter, whether or not there is any reference here to G.xlvi.27, D.xxxii.8, seems to imply that this passage is inserted by a strange hand.

(ii) *v.*8, 'and Cush begat Nimrod,' points to a different writer from the *Jehovist*, who has already named the five sons and two grandsons of Cush in *v.*7.

(iii) יָלַד, 'beget,' as in D.xxxii.18; but D uses also הוֹלִיד, iv.25, xxviii.41.

(iv) *v.*8, 'he began to be a mighty-one in the earth': this personal notice differs from the general style of the chapter, and betrays a strange writer.

(v) *v.*8, הֵחֵל, 'begin,' D.ii.24,25,31,31, iii.24, xvi.9,9, Jo.iii.7(D).

(vi) *v.*8,9,9, גִּבּוֹר, 'mighty-one,' vi.4(D), D.x.17,Jo.i.14,vi.2,viii.3,x.2,7(D),—*nowhere else in the Pentateuch.*

(vii) *v.*9, הוּא הָיָה, 'he was,' Jo.xvii.1 (D).

(viii) *v.*9, עַל־כֵּן, 'therefore,' D.x.9.

(ix) *v.*9, 'before the face of Jehovah,' D.i.45, &c. xxiv.4,13, &c.

N.B. BOEHMER, *p.*161, note, suggests that the name 'Nimrod' may be derived from מָרַד, 'rebel,' and, perhaps, = נַמְרֹד, 'let us rebel'; *comp.* xi.4, 'let us build us a tower and its top reaching to heaven,' and *Targ. Pal. in loco.* 'He was a mighty *rebel* before the Lord . . . there hath not been as Nimrod, mighty in hunting, and a *rebel* before the Lord.'

54. HUPFELD supposes, as in the case of the Sethite names (6) in iv.17–23, that here also the Jehovist gave originally a

complete genealogy of the descendants of Noah—down to Abraham, or beyond him?—which the Compiler has cut off in *v.*25 at Peleg, because he was about to insert the E. list of the same names, which was identical. He writes as follows, *p.*137:—

The genealogy of the line of Shem, standing in close connection with the sacred history, is given by the Elohist, but is left here incomplete. For this chapter gives only the first members of it as far as *Peleg*, which is done in order to arrive at Joktan, the oldest progenitor of the Arabians, about whom E does not trouble himself. The others—Reu, Serug, Nahor, and Terah, with the descent of Abraham—are left out, exactly as the members after Enos in the Sethite genealogy, and manifestly for the same reason as there, because they are given completely out of E, and so would form with these a mere repetition. This, then, would be the *second omission*, which the Compiler has seen it proper to make for obvious reasons in the J. document.

*Ans.* As before, it appears to us that the Jehovist merely wrote to supplement the matter which already lay before him, and that, having some information about the Arabian tribes, which he wished to communicate, he has simply repeated the first few members of the Shemite genealogy in xi.10–26, in order to arrive at Peleg and Joktan. The fact that his list contains exactly seventy names as it now stands (without Nimrod) seems a strong indication that it never really contained more.

It is important to observe that the Jehovistic genealogies in iv.17–22, x.1–7,13–32, relate principally to races, which are only *collaterally* connected with the direct line through Abraham; whereas the Elohist confines himself exclusively to the holy line through Abraham, v.1–32, xi.10–26.

### 55. xi.1–9, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*1, 'all the earth' = its inhabitants, as in ix.19.

(ii) *v.*3, 'one unto his comrade,' *v.*7, 'one of his comrade,' *comp.* xxxi.49, xliii.33, —also D (xv.10).

*(iii) *v.*2, קֶדֶם, 'east,' (3.vi).

*(iv) *v.*3,4,7, הָבָה, הבו, 'give here,' xi.3,4,7,xxix.21,xxx.1°,xxxviii.16, xlvii.15,16.

(v) *v.*3, 'and *the brick* (לַבֵּנָה) was to them *for stone* (לְאָבֶן), and the asphalte (חֵמָר) was to them for *mortar* (חֹמֶר),'—alliterations as in (ō.xvii).

*(vi) *v.*4,8,9, פּוּץ, 'be spread-abroad,' (47.iv).

(vii) *v.*4,8,9, 'upon the face of all the earth,' as in vii.3, viii.9; also E (i.29).

(viii) *v.*5, 'Jehovah came down to see the city,' *v.*7, 'come on, let us go down, and confound their language'; *strong anthropomorphisms*, (3.xx).

(ix) *v.*5, 'the sons of man,' *comp.* 'the daughters of man,' vi.2.

(x) *v.*6, 'and Jehovah said, Behold! &c.'; *comp.* similar secret speeches ascribed to Jehovah in (3.xii).

*(xi) *v.*6, הֵחֵל, *hekhel*, 'begin,' (5.xxix).

*(xii) *v.*9, 'therefore (עַל־כֵּן) one called its name Babel.';

*comp.* xi.9, xvi.14, xix.22, xxi.31, xxv.30, xxvi.33, xxix.34,35, xxx.6ᵇ, xxxi.48, xxxiii.17, l.11.

*(xiii) *v.*9, עַל־כֵּן, 'therefore,' (3.xvii).

(xiv) *v.*9, the name 'Babel' (בָּבֶל) derived from בָּלַל, 'confound,' (3.iv).

N.B. The above derivation of 'Babel,' like that of 'Noah' (11.i), is incorrect. There is little doubt among scholars that the word is properly *Bab-Il*, meaning 'House of God.'

(xv) This account of the confusion of tongues and dispersion of mankind appears to be connected with the J. statement that in Peleg's days 'the earth was divided,' x.25.

N.B. It is not improbable that, as BOEHMER suggests, *p.*172, the word שָׂפָה, 'lip,' may be used in this passage repeatedly, *v.*1,6,7,7,9, in an unusual sense for 'language,' (for which לָשׁוֹן, tongue, is more commonly used, x.5,20,31,) with special reference to the name *Borsippa*, in accordance with the Talmud (BUXTORF. *Lex. p.*362) 'say not *Borsiph* but *Balsiph*, for there בָּלַל שָׂפָה, 'He confounded the lip.'

## 56. BOEHMER, *p.*158, &c. ascribes the above section to the Compiler, and writes thus, *p.*159:—

The commencement of the building at Shinar cannot be thought of *after* Nimrod, if the account is to harmonise in any way with G.x; since Babel is named there as the beginning of his kingdom.(1) He himself, that is, Ninus, founded Babel, and, doubtless, at the time of Peleg.(2)

The Jehovist in his remark upon the name of Peleg, x.25, points to this fact, that Nimrod found a political order already in existence and *destroyed* it;(3) for no more meaning lies in פָּלַג here than in the פָּרַם of Dan. v.28; these words both point not to any division of territory, but rather allow just as well the idea of a strong centralisation, אֶרֶץ here being 'the kingdom,' *comp.*xli.36.(4) Whereas the narrative in xi.1–9 exhibits a state of things, as if Noah and his family, upon their descent from Ararat, were at that time the first and only men who traversed and inhabited that empty district, after the Flood.(5) On account of this variation in the narrative, we must ascribe to the Compiler the story in xi.1–9, and not to the Jehovist, to whom otherwise it might be ascribed, and to whom even HUPFELD ascribes it, *p.*139,223, as if there were no other alternative—notwithstanding that he himself (though upon other insufficient grounds, which are set aside by our own explanation) finds it in contradiction to G.x.

*Ans.* (1) Boehmer's difficulty arises from his having ascribed the account about Nimrod, x.8–12, mainly to the Jehovist, whereas we believe that passage to be a later—probably Deuteronomistic—interpolation (53).

(2) D says that Nimrod founded Babel, x.10; J says *v.*25, that in Peleg's days 'the earth was divided,' and in our view the latter was here preparing for his own narrative now before us in xi.1–9; but the later interpolator has not perceived

the discrepancy which his archæological note in x.10 would introduce into the original story.

(3) This appears to us a very strained interpretation of the words in x.25.

(4) Plainly 'all the earth' in xi.1 means 'all the inhabitants of the earth,' as in ix.19,x.25, *not* 'all the kingdom'—the kingdom of whom?—since the account about Nimrod in x.8–12 is separated from this by a long intervening passage; and that account, moreover, was, according to BOEHMER, written mainly by the *Jehovist*, not the Compiler.

(5) Yet, as BOEHMER himself says, *p.*160, 'Since more than a few sons and grandsons of Noah must have been required for building a city and so colossal a tower, we must suppose the descendants of Noah to have become already the heads of numerous families and tribes,'—*i.e.* we must suppose, what J does, that the event in question did not take place till the days of Peleg, x.25, the *fifth* from Noah.

(6) HUPFELD'S difficulties also are all removed by regarding x.8–12 as a later interpolation.

## 57. xi.10–32, *Elohist*, except *v.*28–30.

This table evidently continues the Elohistic genealogy in v.

(i) *v.*10, 'these are the generations of Shem,' *v.*27, 'and these are the generations of Terah,' (2.iii).

(ii) *v.*10, 'Shem was a son of 100 years'; *comp.* v.32, vii.6,11, from which it appears that 100 years had elapsed from the birth of Shem to the Flood.

N.B. As *v.*10 is generally understood, Shem was only 100 years old at the time of Arphaxad's birth, *two years after* the Flood, and would, therefore, have been 98 years old at most when the Flood began, contrary to the datum in v.32, which states that *Shem*, at all events, was born when Noah was 500 years old, (though Ham and Japheth *might* have been born *after* this date,) and Shem was, therefore, 100 years old *when the Flood began*, vii.6,11. Perhaps, however, it is merely meant in xi.10 to mark Shem's age as 100 when the Flood began, *two years after which* he begat Arphaxad, being himself then 102 years old.

*(iii) *v.*10,25, מֵאָה, 'hundred,' (10.ix).

*(iv) *v.*10,12, &c., הוֹלִיד (*twenty-nine* times), (10.viii).

*(v) *v.*11,13, &c., 'and Shem lived after begetting . . . and begat sons and daughters'; *comp.* the same form of expression v.7,10,13, &c.

(vi) *v.*12,14, חָי, *khay*, 'lived,' as in v.5.

*(vii) *v.*26, 'And Terah lived 70 years, and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran,' followed by *v.*27, 'and these are the generations of Terah: Terah begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran';

*comp.* 'And Noah was a son of 500 years, and Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth,' v.32, followed *originally* (in E) by—

'these are the generations of Noah: . . . Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth,' vi.9,10.

*(viii) *v.*31, 'with (אֵת) them,' used as an expletive, (19.xiv).

*(ix) *v.*32, 'and the days of Terah were 205 years . . . and Terah died';
*comp.* 'and all the days that Adam (Seth, &c.) lived were . . . years, and he died,' v.5,8, &c., ix.29, xi.32.

## 58. xi.28–30, *Jehovist.*

*(i) *v.*28, 'and Haran died (before the face =) *eastward* of his father Terah, in the land of his kindred, in Ur of the Chaldees';
*comp.* 'and *eastward* of all his brethren shall he abide,' xvi.12;
'*eastward* of all his brethren he fell,' xxv.18.
*(ii) *v.*28, 'in the land of his kindred';
*comp.* 'out of thy land and out of thy kindred,' xii.1;
'unto my land and unto my kindred,' xxiv.4;
'out of the land of my kindred,' xxiv.7;
'unto the land of thy fathers and to thy kindred,' xxxi.3;
'unto the land of thy kindred,' xxxi.13;
'to thy land and to thy kindred,' xxxii.9.
(iii) *v.*29, 'and Abram and Nahor took to them wives, the name of Abram's wife, Sarai, and the name of Nahor's wife Milcah';
*comp.* 'and Lamech took to him two wives, the name of the one Adah, and the name of the second Zillah,' iv.19.
*(iv) *v.*30, עֲקָרָה, 'barren,' xxv.21, xxix.31.
(v) *v.*30, the mention of Sarai's barrenness is out of place here: E mentions in the proper place, xvi.1, that 'Sarai bare not to Abraham.'
N.B. J speaks repeatedly of a child, Isaac, being given to *Sarah*, 'there was *to her* no child,' xi.30, 'there shall be a son *to Sarah*,' xviii.10,14,—which forms E never uses, dwelling solely on the promise to *Abraham*, xvii.16,19,21, xxi.2,3,5.
So, again, in the case of Ishmael, J says, 'that *I* (Sarah) may be built-up by her,' xvi.2, '*thou* (Sarah) shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael,' xvi.11; whereas E says, 'Hagar bare *to Abram* a son, and *Abram* called his son's name which Hagar bare, Ishmael,' xvi.15, 'at Hagar's bearing Ishmael *to Abram*,' xvi.16,—which forms, however, J also uses, xxii.20, &c.

## 59. xii.1–20, *Jehovist*, except *v.*4$^{b}$,5.

*(i) *v.*1, 'out of thy land and out of thy kindred,' (58.ii).
(ii) *v.*2, 'I will *make* thee for a great nation';
*comp.* 'for a great nation will I *place* thee,' xlvi.3:
E has also 'I *give* him for a great nation,' xvii.20.
*(iii) *v.*3, 'him that curseth thee will I curse,' *comp.* the curses (4.xiv).
*(iv) *v.*3, 'families of the *ground*,' (3.iii).
(v) *v.*6, 'and Abram passed-through in the land';
*comp.* 'and he passed-through in all the land of Egypt,' xli.46.
(vi) *v.*7, 'and Jehovah appeared unto him,' xii.7, xviii.1, xxvi.2,24.
(vii) *v.*7, 'to thy seed will I give this land';

*comp.* 'to thee will I give it and to thy seed,' xiii.15;
'to thee will I give it,' xiii.17;
'to thy seed will I give this land,' xxiv.7;
'to thee will I give it and to thy seed,' xxviii.13:
D has also 'to thy seed do I give this land,' xv.18.

*(viii) *v.*7,8, 'build an altar to Jehovah,' (45.ii).

*(ix) *v.*8, 'pitch tent,' xii.8, xxvi.25, xxxi.25, xxxiii.19,' xxxv.21; *comp.* 'move-tent,' xiii.12$^{b}$,18.

*(x) *v.*8, נָטָה, 'extend,' xii.8, xxiv.14, xxvi.25, xxxiii.19, xxxv.21, xxxviii.1,16, xxxix.21, xlix.15.

*(xi) *v.*8,8, קֶדֶם, 'east,' (3.vi).

*(xii) *v.*8, 'call on the name of Jehovah,' (5.xxx).

(xiii) *v.*9, 'going and removing' = removing continually, (38.N.B.).

*(xiv) *v.*10, כָּבֵד, 'heavy,' xii.10, xli.31, xliii.1, xlvii.4,13, l.9,10,11; *comp.* כָּבֵד, 'be heavy,' xiii.2, xviii.20, xxxiv.19, xlviii.10, כָּבוֹד, 'glory,' xxxi.1, xlv.13, xlix.6.

*(xv) *v.*11, הִנֵּה־נָא, 'behold, I pray,' xii.11, xvi.2, xviii.27,31, xix.2,8,19,20, xxvii.2.

(xvi) *v.*11, 'fair of form,' xii.11, xxix.17, xxxix.6; *comp.* 'goodly of form,' xxiv.16, xxvi.7,—also $E_2$ (294.iv).

*(xvii) *v.*12, הָרַג, 'kill,' (5.xii).

(xviii) *v.*13, לְמַעַן, 'in order that,' xii.13, xviii.24, xxvii.25, xxxvii.22, l.20—also D (98.vi).

*(xix) *v.*13,16, בַּעֲבוּר, 'for the sake of,' (4 xviii).

(xx) *v.*13, 'my soul shall live,' as in xix.20.

(xxi) *v.*13, 'my soul,' *comp.* 'thy soul,' 'his soul,' 'her soul,' xii.13, xix.17,19,20, xxvii.4,19,25,31, xxxii.30, xxxiv.3,8, xxxv.18, xlii.21, xliv.30,30, xlix.6:
E has also 'your soul,' xxiii.8.

(xxii) *v.*16, 'flocks and herds and he-asses and servants and maids and she-asses';
*comp.* 'cattle and silver and gold,' xiii.2;
'flocks and herds and tents,' xiii.5;
'flocks and herds, and silver and gold, and servants and maids, and camels and he-asses,' xxiv.35;
'cattle of flocks and cattle of herds and (much service) many servants,' xxvi.14;
'many flocks and maids and servants and camels and he-asses,' xxx.43;
'oxen, and he-asses, flocks, and servants, and maids,' xxxii.5;
'flocks and herds and camels,' xxxii.7;
'flocks and herds,' xxi.27, xxxiii.13, xlv.10, xlvi.32, xlvii.1, l.8;
'flocks and herds and he-asses,' xxxiv.28;
'cattle of flocks and cattle of herds and he-asses,' xlvii.17:
$E_2$ has it also in xx.14.

*(xxiii) *v.*16, 'camel,' xii.16, xxiv.10,11, &c. (*eighteen* times), xxx.43, xxxi.17,34, xxxii.7(8),15(16), xxxvii.25.

(xxiv) *v.*17, 'Pharaoh and his house,' (22.i).

(xxv) *v.*17, עַל־דְּבַר, 'because of,' xii.17, xx.18, xliii.18—also $E_2$ (xx.11).

(xxvi) *v.*18, 'what is this thou hast done to me?' (4.xiii).

(xxvii) *v.*18, עָשָׂה לִי, 'do to,' (47.ix).

(xxviii) *v.*20, כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ, 'all which is his,' &c., xii.20, xiii.1, xix.12, xxiv.2,36, xxv.5, xxxi.1,21, xxxix.4,5,5,6,8, xlv.10,11, xlvi.1,32, xlvii.1,4,6, *comp.* אֲשֶׁר אִתּוֹ, xxxii.23(24), xxxiii.9,11, כָּל אֲשֶׁר עִמּוֹ, xxxv.2,6;

$E_2$ has a similar phrase, xx.7, and $J_2$, xiv.23, but not E.

## 60. xii.4$^b$,5, *Elohist.*

(i) *v.*4$^b$, date of Abram's migration to Canaan (10.vii).

(ii) *v.*4$^b$, יָצָא, 'go-out,' the same word used as in the E context, xi.31; whereas J uses יָלַךְ in this context, xii.1,4,4.

(iii) *v.*4$^b$,5, 'Charran' refers to xi.31,32(E).

(iv) *v.*5, 'and Abram took Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother's son';

*comp.* 'and Terah took Abram his son, and Lot the son of Haran, his son's son,' xi.31.

*(v) *v.*5, 'and Abram *took* Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother's son, and *all their gain* (רְכוּשׁ) *which they had gotten* (רָכַשׁ), and *the souls which they had made in Charran*';

*comp.* 'and he led-off all *his cattle*, and *all his gain which he had gotten*, the cattle of *his property* (קִנְיָן) *which he had gotten in Padan-Aram*,' xxxi.18;

'and Esau *took* his wives and his sons and his daughters, and all *the souls* of his house, and *his cattle* and all his beasts and all *his property which he had gotten in the land of Canaan*,' xxxvi.6;

'and they *took their cattle* and *their gain which they had gotten in the land of Canaan*,' xlvi.6.

*(vi) *v.*5, 'and they went-out . . . to go to the land of Canaan, and they came, &c.;'

*comp.* 'and they went-out . . . to go to the land of Canaan, and they came, &c.,' xi.31.

(vii) *v.*5, נֶפֶשׁ, 'soul,' used for 'person,' xii.5, xvii.14, xxxvi.6, xlvi.15,18,22, 25,26,26,27,—also xiv.21 ($J_2$).

(viii) *v.*5, 'and they went-out to go to the land of Canaan,' repeats what has been already said in *v.*4$^a$, 'and Abraham went, as Jehovah had spoken unto him'; or rather J in the latter passage repeats the statement of E in the former.

N.B. HUPFELD, *p.*21, thinks that *v.*4$^b$ may have originally '*followed* *v.*5, and been removed to its present place by the Compiler. But this does not seem necessary.

61. It will be observed that, according to E, Terah migrates from Ur of the Chaldees with the distinct purpose of 'going to *the land of Canaan*,' xi.31: he stops, however, on the way in

Charran, 'dwells' there, *v.*31, and 'dies' there, *v.*32. Further, since Terah was 70 years old at Abram's birth, xi.26, and therefore 145 years old at the time of Abram's migration from Charran, xii.4$^{b}$, and also died at the age of 205, it follows that Abram, according to E, must have left Charran 60 years before his father's death; so that the event in xi.32 must be regarded as subsequent in point of time to that in xii.4$^{b}$.

62. But it is very noticeable that E represents Abram as merely continuing *of his own accord* the migration begun by his father, xii.4$^{b}$,5, without having received any previous *call* or promise of blessing; and he makes Abram receive this blessing *twenty-four years later, comp.* xii.4$^{b}$,xvii.1, when he had been already for a long time settled in Canaan. Thus according to E, Abram migrates from Charran *proprio motu*, with the express intention of 'going to the land of Canaan,' xii.5, whereas J represents him as starting from *his own country*, xii.4$^{a}$, *i.e.* apparently, Charran, which J calls the 'land of his kindred,' xxiv.4,7,—but starting *by the express command of Jehovah*, and with the promise of great blessings, to go to an *unknown* land, which Jehovah would 'show' him, xii.1–3, as the apostle says, 'not knowing whither he went,' Heb.xi.8.

N.B. HUPFELD, *p.*140, supposes that Abraham received this call in 'Ur of the Chaldees,' as stated in xv.1, which latter passage he ascribes also to the Jehovist. But the expressions in xxiv.4,7, seem to determine 'Charran,' as Abram's home, the 'land of his kindred;' and we do *not* assign xv to J.

63. xiii.1–18, *Jehovist*, except *v.*6,12$^{a}$.

*(i) *v.*1, 'he and his wife and all which he had,' as in xii.20.

(ii) *v.*1, כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ, 'all which was his,' (59.xxviii).

(iii) *v.*1,3, the Negeb or south-country, as in xii.9.

*(iv) *v.*2, כָּבֵד, 'be heavy,' (59.xiv).

(v) *v.*2, 'cattle and silver and gold,' *v.*5, 'flocks and herds and tents,' (59.xxii).

*(vi) *v.*3,4, 'unto Bethel, unto the place where his tent was in the beginning, between Bethel and Ai, unto the place of the altar which he made there at first; and there Abram called on the name of Jehovah;'

*comp.* 'and pitched his tent, Bethel being seaward and Ai eastward, and he built there an altar to Jehovah, and called on the name of Jehovah,' xii.8.

(vii) *v.*3, בָּרִאשִׁית, 'in the beginning,' (5.xxix).

*(viii) *v.*4, 'call on the name of Jehovah,' (5.xxx).

(ix) *v.*5, 'Lot who went with Abram'; *comp.* 'Lot went with him,' xii.4ᵃ.

*(x) *v.*7, 'and the Canaanite and Perizzite were then dwellers in the land';

*comp.* 'and the Canaanite was then in the land,' xii.6;

'among the dwellers in the land, among the Canaanites, and among the Perizzites,' xxxiv.30;

'the dweller in the land, the Canaanite,' l.11.

(xi) *v.*7, 'dweller in the land,' xiii.7, xxxiv.30, xxxvi.20, l.11, *comp.* 'dwellers in the cities,' xix.25.

*(xii) *v.*8, אַל־נָא, 'let not, I pray,' xiii.8, xviii.3,30,32, xix.7,18, xxxiii.10, xlvii.29.

(xiii) *v.*9, 'is not the whole land before thee?'

*comp.* 'the land shall be before you,' xxxiv.10;

'the land is broad on both hands before them,' xxxiv.21;

'the land of Egypt is before thee,' xlvii.6:

$E_2$ has 'my land is before thee,' xx.15.

*(xiv) *v.*9,11,14, הִפָּרֵד, 'be separated,' (3.x).

*(xv) *v.*10,14, 'lift-up the eyes and see,' xiii.10,14, xviii.2, xxii.4,13, xxiv.63,64, xxxi.10,12, xxxiii.1,5, xxxvii.25, xliii.29.

(xvi) *v.*10, 'Sodom and Gomorrah,' as in x.19, xiii.10; *comp.* (50.xi):

E never *names* them, but calls them 'the cities of the circuit,' xiii.12ᵃ, xix.29.

*(xvii) *v.*10, 'at thy going to Zoar,' (50.ix).

*(xviii) *v.*11, קֶדֶם, 'east,' (3.vi).

*(xix) *v.*12ᵇ,18, אָהַל, 'move-tent,' only besides in Is.xiii.20, *comp.* (59.ix).

(xx) *v.*12ᵇ,13, 'Sodom,' (50.xi).

*(xxi) *v.*14, רְאֵה, 'see,' = 'behold!' xiii.14, xxvii.27, xxxi.12,50, xli.41; *comp.* xxxix.14.

(xxii) *v.*15, 'the land which thou seest';

*comp.* 'the land which I will make thee to see,' xii.1.

(xxiii) *v.*15, 'to thee will I give it and to thy seed,' *v.*17, 'to thee will I give it,' (59.vii).

(xxiv) *v.*16, 'I will place thy seed as the dust of the earth, so that if a man shall be able to count the dust of the earth, also thy seed shall be counted';

*comp.* 'I will surely multiply thy seed, and it shall not be counted for multitude,' xvi.10;

'and I will multiply thy seed,' xxvi.24;

'and thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth,' xxviii.14;

'I will place thy seed as the sand of the sea, which cannot be counted for multitude,' xxii.12;

'and they shall swarm-as-fish for multitude,' xlviii.16;

'and his seed shall be the fulness of the nations,' xlviii.19:

D also has similar expressions (xv.5, xxii.17, xxvi.4).

(xxv) *v.*17, קוּם, *kum*, 'arise' = set-out, xiii.17, xviii.16, xix.14,15, xxii.3,19, xxiv.10,54,61, xxv.34, xxvii.43, xxxi.17,21, xxxii.22(23), xxxv.3, xxxviii.19, xliii. 8,15, xlvi.5:

E has it once (xxviii.2), and $E_2$ (xxi.32).

*(xxvi) *v.*18, 'build an altar to Jehovah,' (45.ii

64. xiii.6,12ª, *Elohist.*

*(i) *v.*6, '*and the land did not bear them to dwell together; for their gain* (רְכוּשָׁם) *was much, and they were not able to dwell together*';

*comp.* '*for their gain was much, above dwelling together; and the land* of their sojournings *was not able to bear them* because of their cattle,' xxxvi.7.

*(ii) *v.*12ª, '*Lot dwelt in the cities of the circuit*';

*comp.* 'when Elohim destroyed *the cities of the circuit*,' xix.29;

'He overthrew *the cities in which Lot dwelt*,' xix.29.

N.B. E never mentions Sodom or Gomorrah by name.

65. Both HUPFELD and BOEHMER assign xiii.11ᵇ to E; but it seems to belong to J for the following reasons:—

(i) הִפָּרֵד, 'be separated,' (3.x).

(ii) 'separated' in *v.*11ᵇ refers back to 'separate' in *v.*9, and is referred to afterwards in *v.*14.

66. xiv.1–24. HUPFELD, *p.*142, assigns this section to the *Jehovist*, who thus 'secures for Abraham a kind of moral claim to a right of citizenship in the land of Canaan,' by delivering it from the inroad of its enemies. But, *p.*188, he supposes that he may '*probably have derived it from an older source.*'

BOEHMER, *p.*110,111, gives it to the *Second Elohist*, who, in his view, did not abstain *invariably* from the use of the name 'Jehovah,' *v.*22, though using much more freely the name 'Elohim.' As this point is one of some importance to our future decisions, we shall here consider BOEHMER's arguments.

HUPFELD ascribes xiv, xv to the Jehovist, [except, perhaps, xv.13–16, which may be a later insertion, HUPF. p.143.] We only agree with him in this, that some part of xv is due to the Compiler,(1) and that both chapters are [generally] due to one and the same author. The connection of these chapters, which is not rightly exhibited by commentators, is this, that Abraham, when he had [in xiv] given a proof of his great unselfishness, and had renounced all reward from the hand of *man*, receives from *God* a gift of the whole land of Canaan, whose enemies he had so manfully vanquished.(2) Some phenomena which these two chapters have

in common, as the collective singular 'the fugitive,' xiv.13, *comp.* 'the fowl,' 'the vulture,' xv.10,11, and similarly the collective names of peoples, xiv.6,7, xv.20,21, especially 'the Amorite,' xiv.7, xv.21, and the mention of Damascus, xiv.15, xv.2, (which occurs nowhere else in the Thora,) serve to confirm this connection.(3)

It might not certainly be easy to prove that this narrative is *not* from the hand of the *Jehovist*, or *not* adopted by him from an older source, (as HUPFELD considers to be probable with respect to xiv); since it does not contradict the tenor of his narrative, and is quite permissible in it. For the fact that in xiv.12,13, Lot, Abram, and Mamre, seems to be presented to us in such a way as if they had never been named by the writer before, [as in xiii.18,] may be explained by the consideration that just exactly here, where mention is made of warlike events out of the great world-history, the closer description of Abram as 'the Hebrew,' and of Mamre as 'the Amorite,' was quite in place.(4) And, in fact, Laban is called 'the Aramæan' in xxxi.20, although he had been spoken of just before.(5)

But, when on the one hand we consider how readily these chapters may be *dispensed with* in the J. story, to which even without their notice [in xv.4] there still remains the more distinct promise of the birth of Isaac in xviii.10,14,(6) and when on the other hand we observe that xiv,xv are exactly suited to serve as the commencement of the work of that author, [the *Second Elohist*,] whose narrative HUPFELD has endeavoured to restore from xx forward, we shall not hesitate to give the preference to the conjecture, which assigns the two chapters in question to $E_2$.(7) That the divine revelation in xv.1,4, is introduced with the formula, (which never occurs elsewhere in the Thora,) 'the word of Jehovah came to Abraham,'—a formula applied regularly in this manner to the revelations imparted to the later prophets,—agrees with the fact that in xx.7, and only there, Abraham is expressly called a 'prophet.'(8) With יִירַשׁ 'inherit,' xv.4,7,8, *comp.* xxi.10.(9) Surely, the connection of xiv,xv with $E_2$ has only been obscured from HUPFELD by his theory, which regards this writer as *exclusively Elohistic*. This assumption, however, *viz.* that the name 'Jehovah' is never used by him, rests simply upon an incomplete induction.(10) In presence of the other facts, we have rather to assume that $E_2$, no less than E and J, names the Deity, even in the pre-Mosaic times, 'Jehovah' as well as 'Elohim.'(11) Hence there is no reason on this account for ascribing xx.18 to the Compiler, which HUPFELD does finally, (*p.*202,203, *comp.* p.49,50,) only because of its containing the name 'Jehovah.'(12) In the commencement of a proper work, which should set forth the history of the descendants of Abraham, and specially of the children of Israel, the manner in which this writer, after a general notice about the historical situation of that epoch, introduces Abram, not incidentally, but with a formal preparation, is quite appropriate.(13)

67. To the above reasoning we must reply as follows:—

(1) We shall show (77–83) that not xv.18–21 only, as HUPFELD suggests, but the *whole* of xv, is a later insertion.

(2) The connection noticed by BOEHMER may exist just as well, if a *later* writer inserted xv *after* xiv with a view to the very point in question.

(3) The first of the examples here produced, 'the fugitive,' *is* peculiar; but *that*

does *not* occur in xv. The others are mere ordinary instances of 'nouns of multitude' or 'national names,' *e.g.* 'the fowl,' 'the vulture,' Ez.xxxix.4,17, Ps.viii.9, cxlviii.10, Is.xviii.6, Jer.xii.9,—'Jebusite,' 'Amorite,' &c. x.16–18. The mention of Damascus in both chapters, xiv.15, xv.2, might be of weight, if supported by other corroborative evidence of the unity of authorship in the two chapters. But these are the *only* phenomena which BOEHMER adduces to prove that a similarity of style exists in them.

(4) The abrupt mention of 'Abram the Hebrew' in xiv.13 *would* appear to us very strange, if written by the same author who had already written xii, xiii; and the description added 'For he dwelt by the terebinths of Mamre the Amorite, brother of Eshcol and brother of Aner,' does not sound as if proceeding from the same hand which had only just before written, 'Abram came and dwelt by the terebinths of Mamre,' xiii.18.

(5) This remark is true: but the writer of xxxi.20 was not (in our view) writing an independent narrative, but had before him, the formula of $E_1$, 'Laban the Aramæan,' xxv.20, under which he is '*first* introduced into the history, and might use it afterwards, or not, as he pleased. Nowhere is Abram called 'the Hebrew' except in xiv.13.

(6) These two chapters may certainly, as BOEHMER allows, be dispensed with from the J. narrative, and do not, as we believe, either of them, belong to it.

(7) But *did* this writer, the '*Second Elohist*, write, as HUPFELD and BOEHMER suppose, a complete independent narrative? If *not*,—and the evidence now seems to us convincing that he did *not* write such a narrative, but wrote only to supplement the story of E, which lay before him,—then the reason for assigning these chapters to $E_2$, because they would form a suitable 'commencement' to his story, (which, however, we do not allow,) falls away altogether.

(8) It will be seen (84) that we believe xv to have been inserted by a later prophet, who in *v.*1,4, fell naturally into the use of the ordinary prophetical formula. But the fact, that נָבִיא 'prophet,' is found in xx.7, shows only that this chapter was probably not written till after Samuel's time, when this word, it would seem, was not yet in use, 1S.ix.9.

(9) Observe that יָרַשׁ, though occurring in xv.3,4,4,7,8, does *not* occur at all in xiv; and observe also that it occurs 68 times in Deuteronomy, and 29 times in the Deuteronomistic parts of Joshua, and only 24 times in the rest of the Pentateuch. This, indeed, is one of the grounds on which we assign xv to the Deuteronomist (79.vi): but no such evidence can be produced in the case of xiv.

(10) The progress of our analysis will, as we believe, satisfy the reader that HUPFELD's view is correct on this point, *viz.* that neither E nor $E_2$, in its *original* form, contained the name 'Jehovah' before the account of the revelation of that name to Moses.

(11) That is to say, BOEHMER supposes that the 'Jehovah,' which now appears in xvii.1, was originally due to E, as to which see (90,91).

(12) Our view in xx.18 is given below (106,107).

(13) HUPFELD's view is certainly exposed to this objection, that xx begins

abruptly, and not at all like the commencement of a complete independent narrative. But the passages recovered for $E_2$ appear to us merely as interpolations, intended to supplement the original narrative, and in that case they would need no introduction.

68. If more were needed to disprove the truth of BOEHMER'S theory, it would be the fact, that he is obliged to assign the introductory words in xiv.1, 'and it came to pass,' to the later Compiler, *p.*197 :—

'It is not probable that this independent narrative should have begun with 'and it came to pass'; and there is no ground for assuming that anything has been cancelled *before* it. Rather, its account opens quite suitably and satisfactorily, with a definition of the time when Abram takes a part for the first time in the great world-history, *viz.* by his victory over the lord of Shinar and his confederates.

Upon our own view, however, which agrees here substantially with HUPFELD'S, there is no necessity for doing any such violence to this passage. It is merely a fragmentary story, disjoined from all before and after, which has been here inserted —perhaps by the Jehovist, and derived by him, as HUPFELD says, from an *older* source—as the description of a remarkable passage in the life of Abraham. Only we see no reason to suppose that the writer of this chapter,—whom we shall denote by $J_2$ and call the *Second Jehovist*, though probably in *time* antecedent to the Jehovist himself,—composed a complete narrative, or wrote any other portion of the present Pentateuch. At all events, his hand has not been traced in any other part of it. And it is just as easy to conceive that the Jehovist may have inserted this chapter *by itself*—the work, it may be, of a friend—as a separate episode in Abraham's life, for which insertion, however, he has prepared by introducing the notice of xiii.18, that Abram had settled 'by the terebinths of Mamre.'

69. xiv.1–24, *Second Jehovist*, except notes in *v.*2,3,7,8,17.

This chapter contains 'Jehovah' in *v.*22 : but it betrays no special signs of relation to the *three* writers already known to us—*Elohist, Jehovist, Deuteronomist.* And it has certain peculiarities of style of its own, which seem to mark it as the

work of a *fourth* writer, whose hand cannot be traced in any other part of the Pentateuch.

(i) *v.*18,19,20,22, אֵל עֶלְיוֹן, 'El Most High,' a designation of the Divine Being, which occurs nowhere else in the Pentateuch, and only *thrice* besides in the Bible, Ps.lvii.2(3), lxxviii.35,56, though 'Most High' is found in N.xxiv.16, D.xxxii 8, and occurs often in the Psalms and elsewhere. If it be said that this name is used here with reference to *Melchizedek*, who is called 'a priest of El Most High,' *v.*18, yet the above quotations from the Psalms show that the expression was in use by pious *Israelites*; and the fact, that it is found nowhere else in the Pentateuch, seems to indicate that the writer, who has employed it *four* times in *v.*18–22, cannot have written much besides of the Pentateuch.

(ii) *v.*19,22, 'Proprietor (קֹנֵה, *lit.* 'purchaser') of Heaven and Earth,' another designation of the Divine Being, which is found nowhere else in the Bible.

70. There are some other expressions in this chapter, which are not found elsewhere in the Pentateuch, and some which occur nowhere else in the Bible. But in consequence of the scanty remains of the Hebrew Literature, which have come down to us, the same might be said of almost any chapter in the Bible. The mere existence therefore of *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* could not be regarded as a sure indication of difference of authorship, unless they happened to be very numerous, which is not the case here. In fact, with the exception of some of the proper names of Places and Persons, there are only *two* phrases in the chapter, which occur nowhere else in the *Bible*.

(i) *v.*13, בַּעַל בְּרִית, 'lord of a covenant' = in covenant with:

but *comp.* 'lord of dreams,' G.xxxvii.19, 'lords of arrows,' G.xlix.23, 'lord of words,' E.xxiv.14, 'lord of lending,' D.xv.2, and 'Baal-Berith,' Ju.viii.33, ix.4.

(ii) *v.*14, חָנִיךְ, 'trained-servant':

but *comp.* חָנַךְ, 'instruct, consecrate,' D.xx.5,5, 1K.viii.63, 2Ch.vii.5, Pr.xxii.6.

71. However, the use of the Divine Name, 'El Most High,' *four* times, and of the peculiar designation, 'Proprietor of Heaven and Earth,' *twice*, of which the former occurs no more in the Pentateuch, and the latter no more in the Bible, is, as we have said, a strong indication that the writer of this chapter has not been very much concerned in the composition of the Pentateuch, and is, therefore, different, at all events, from the *Elohist*, *Jehovist*, and *Deuteronomist*, and also from the *Second Elohist*, to whom, as we shall see, is due a large part of

Genesis. As he uses 'Jehovah' in *v.*22, we may regard him as a *Jehovistic* writer. But his style seems more antiquated than that of the principal Jehovist, who wrote G.ii.4$^{b}$–25,iii,iv,&c.

72. Accordingly, this section, as already observed, contains no distinct traces of either of the above four writers; though, as might be expected, it exhibits a few points of slight resemblance to *each* of them.

(i) *v.*1,9, 'Shinar,' G.x.10, xi.2(J).

(ii) *v.*2, 'make war,' D.xx.12,20(D).

(iii) *v.*2,8,10,11, 'Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboim,' G.x.19(J), D.xxix.23(D), *nowhere else in the Bible.*

(iv) *v.*11,12,16,16,21, רְכוּשׁ, 'gain,' G.xii.5, xiii.6, xxxi.18, xxxvi.7, xlvi.6(E), xv.14(D), also N.xvi.32, xxxv.3, and *nowhere else in the Bible*, except in later writers, 1Ch., 2Ch., Ezr., Dan.

(v) *v.*13, 'he was abiding (שָׁכַן) by the terebinths of Mamre';

*comp.* 'he dwelt (יָשַׁב) by the terebinths of Mamre,' xiii.18(J), and notice that the *verbs* are different.

(vi) *v.*14, 'offspring of the house'=house-born servants, G.xvii.12,13,23,27(E), also L.xxii.11, Jer.ii.14, *nowhere else in the Bible.*

(vii) *v.*21, נֶפֶשׁ, 'soul,' used for 'person,' G.xii.5, xvii.14, xxxvi.6, xlvi.15,18,22, 25,26,26,27(E).

(viii) *v.*22, 'lift the hand'=swear, D.xxxii.40(D).

But the above are only slight points of contact with the other writers of the Pentateuch. Or, if (iv), (vi), (vii), correspond somewhat with the style of E, (as they *disagree* with that of J,) yet the notion that this chapter is due to the Elohist is at once contradicted by the occurrence of many expressions, which are never used elsewhere by this writer, but are found used by J, $E_2$, and D, *e.g.* 'serve,' 'servant,' *v.*4,15, 'Sodom,' *v.*2,8,10, &c. 'smite,' *v.*5,7,15,17, 'abide,' *v.*13, 'go to meet,' *v.*17, the 'oath,' *v.*22, 'all which is thine,' *v.*23, בִּלְעֲדֵי, 'besides,' *v.*24, רַק, 'only,' *v.*24, נַעַר, 'lad,' *v.*24, besides the name 'Jehovah,' *v.*22.

73. BOEHMER, *p.*198, assigns *v.*20$^{b}$, 'and he gave to him the tithes of all,' to the later Compiler, considering that these words are inconsistent with Abram's statement in *v.*23, that he had sworn not to take the least thing for himself; and he conjectures that the Compiler, a priest of Jerusalem, introduced this instance of Abram paying tithes to the priest-king of *Salem, i.e. Jerusalem*, in order to counterbalance the promise of Jacob in xxviii.22, that he would pay tithes at *Bethel*, the sacred place of the northern kingdom.

But to this opinion BOEHMER is very much guided by his view of the *authorship* of xxviii.22, which he assigns—not, as we do, to the *Jehovist*, but—to the *Second Elohist*, whom, however, he regards as a man from the northern kingdom, and showing strong predilections for it. There is surely no inconsistency in Abram's words or actions as here described. He has sworn only to take nothing *for himself*, 'lest thou shouldst say, I have made Abram rich,' *v.*23: but that would not prevent his making a thank-offering for his victory to 'El Most High,' in the person of his priest Melchizedek.

74. This chapter contains many ancient names of places, which are frequently expressed also by their later equivalents, as *v.*2,8, 'Bela, *that is Zoar*,' *v.*3, 'the vale of Siddim, *that is the Salt Sea*,' *v.*7, 'Em Mishpat, *that is Kadesh*,' *v.*17, 'the valley of Shaveh, *that is the King's dale*.'

The question now arises whether these explanatory notes are due to the original writer, or were inserted by a later hand. The latter seems most probable, and, perhaps, it is even implied in the fact that in *v.*8 we have repeated a *second* time, 'Bela, *that is Zoar*,' which looks more like the note of an interpolator, than the observation of an original writer. There are also other ancient names of places in this chapter, which are *not* explained by modern names, as 'Ellasar,' *v.*1, 'Ashteroth-Karnaim,' 'Ham,' *v.*5, 'Hobah,' *v.*15, and the later equivalent of 'Hazazon-Tamar,' *v.*7,—'*that is Engedi*,' 2Ch.xx.2—is *not* here given.

75. Now many of the names of places and peoples mentioned in this chapter are mentioned also by the *Deuteronomist*, as 'Rephaim,' D.ii.11,20,20, iii.11,13,—see (18.i),—'Ashteroth-Karnaim,' *comp.* 'Ashteroth in Edrei,' D.i.4, 'Zuzim'=Zamzummim,' D.ii.20, 'Emim,' D.ii.10,11, 'Horim,' D.ii.12,22, 'Seir,' D.i.2,44,ii,1,4,&c., 'El Paran'='Elath,' D.ii.8, 'Paran,' D.i.1, xxxiii.2, 'Kadesh,' D.i.2,19,46,ii.14,ix.23, 'Amalekite,' D.xxv. 17,19, 'Amorite,' D.i.4,7,19,20,&c.

Also the 'Salt Sea,' which is given in *v.*3 as the later equivalent for the 'Vale of Siddim,' is mentioned in N.xxxiv.3,12, but also in D.iii.17, *comp.*xxix.23, and in Jo.iii.16,xii.3,xv.2,5,xviii. 19,—but *nowhere else in the Bible*; and of these passages in Joshua, Jo.iii.16 is very probably due to the Deuteronomist (see Chap. I.), and it contains the formula 'the Sea of the Arabah, the Salt Sea,' just exactly as in D.iii.17.

76. It seems probable, therefore, that the interpolator above indicated may have been the Deuteronomistic Editor, who was evidently a great antiquarian (18), and may have appended the modern names to some of the ancient ones employed by the older writer. But if so, then, probably, the other explanatory notes of the same kind, which occur in Genesis, may all be due to the same hand. And, in fact, as we have had strong indications that the Deuteronomist has revised and retouched the older matter, which is mixed up with his own in the Book of Joshua, so it is very reasonable to suppose that he may have also revised and retouched the Book of Genesis as it came into his hands—of which fact we have seen some signs already (16-18, 51-53), and shall see more as we proceed.

77. xv.1-21, *Deuteronomist.*

This chapter is manifestly interpolated, since E records the covenant made with Abram in xvii as something quite new, without making any reference whatever to that here described, as having been already made with him. The E. narrative also describes a simple promise, without any formal procedure like that which is here detailed. But it cannot belong to the Jehovist, since the statement in *v.*7, that 'Jehovah *brought out* Abram from *Ur* of the Chaldees,' agrees neither with the statements of the Elohist, that *Terah* brought Abram from Ur to Charran, xi.31, and then Abram *of his own accord* carried out his father's purpose of migrating to Canaan, xii.4 , nor with that of the Jehovist in xii.4$^{b}$, that Abram left *Charran* by Divine command, 'not knowing whither he went.'

78. DELITZSCH notes on this chapter as follows, *p.*366 :—

This chapter is peculiar, like the foregoing, but yet more strikingly. Just as in ii.4–iii.24 the double name 'Jehovah-Elohim' prevails as nowhere else, so here we find the double name 'Adonai-Elohim,' (which occurs only besides in D.iii.24, ix.26, in the whole Pentateuch,) *twice together*, *v.*2,8, as it is found *four* times together in Is.l.4–9. Generally, this section, in accordance with the fundamental character of the Jehovist, is throughout prophetical.

HUPFELD ascribes this chapter to the Jehovist, except that as to *v.*13–16 he writes as follows, *p.*143, note :—

This passage, xv.13–16, which reaches far beyond the direct object of the writer, stands certainly in somewhat loose connection with the transaction, and leaves room for doubt whether it existed in the original document of the Jehovist, or stands now in the right place, or whether it is not, perhaps, a *later insertion.*

BOEHMER, as we have seen, gives this chapter as well as xiv to the *Second Elohist*, except *v.*3,12–17[a], which he assigns to the *later Compiler.*

79. It will be seen that HUPFELD is inclined—and still more decisively BOEHMER—to give a *portion* of this chapter to a later author. We give the *whole* of it to the later *Editor*, whom we identify with the *Deuteronomist*, and detect the following signs of his hand.

(i) *v.*1, 'after these things': the indefiniteness of this statement of time seems to imply that this is an interpolated passage; and this formula does not agree with the other J. formula, '*and it came to pass* after these things,' xxii.1,20, xxxix.7,xl.1,xlviii.1, and indeed occurs *nowhere else in the Bible*, except Est.ii.1,iii.1.

(ii) *v.*1,4, 'the word of Jehovah came unto' (הָיָה אֶל), a later prophetical formula, *used nowhere else in the Pentateuch*—which fact tends to show that this passage most probably does *not* belong to the *Jehovist*, since he speaks frequently of Divine Revelations to the Patriarchs, vii.1,xii.1,xii.7,xiv.7,xxvi.2, &c., yet he never uses this formula: but the same argument does not apply with the same force against the Deuteronomist, since no similar instance of Divine Revelation is recorded in the Book of Deuteronomy.

Further, this phrase does not occur in any of the prophecies of Isaiah, (though it is found once in the *history*, Is.xxxviii.4,) nor in those of any of the prophets *before* Jeremiah, (though it is found in the introductory formulæ, Hos. i.1, Joel i.1, Jon. i.1, iii.1, Mic. i.1, Zeph. i.1, inserted here, perhaps, by the Editor or Compiler of these prophecies.) But it is frequently applied by *Jeremiah*,—the contemporary, at all events, of the Deuteronomist,—and often in places, where it must have been used by the prophet himself, *e.g.* i.4,11,13, ii.1, xiii.3,8, xvi.1, xviii.5, &c.

N.B. The expression in N.xxiii.5,16, is—not 'the word of Jehovah came unto Balaam,' but in each instance,—'Jehovah put a word in the mouth of Balaam.'

(iii) *v.*1, 'fear not,' D.i.21,29,iii.2,xx.3,xxxi.6,8—also $E_2$(xxi.17) and J(171.xiv).

(iv) *v.*1, 'I am thy shield'; *comp.* 'Jehovah, the shield of thy help,' D.xxxiii.29.

(v) *v.*2,8, 'Adonai-Jehovah,' as in D.iii.24,ix.26,—*nowhere else in the Pentateuch.*

(vi) *v.*3,4,4, יָרַשׁ, 'inherit,' with the acc. of the *person* inherited, D.ii.12,21,22,ix.1, xi.23, xii.2,29,29, xviii.14, xix.1, xxxi.3, and also N.xxi.32—*nowhere else in the Pentateuch*: but the verb occurs 68 times in Deuteronomy, and 29 times in the D. parts of Joshua, and only 24 times in other portions of the Pentateuch, of which some at least are due to the Deuteronomist himself, as G.xv.3,4,4, xxii.17.

(vii) *v.*5, 'number the stars if thou art able to number them—so shall thy seed be';

*comp.* 'I will surely multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, and as the sand which is on the lip of the sea,' xxii.17(D);

'I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven,' xxvi.4(D);

'Jehovah hath multiplied you, and behold ye are this day as the stars of heaven for multitude,' D.i.10;

'Jehovah hath placed thee as the stars of heaven for multitude,' D.x.22;

'ye were as the stars of heaven for multitude,' D. xxviii.62;

*comp.* also D.vii.13, xiii.17, xxviii.63, xxx.5:

J has somewhat similar expressions (63.xxv); but he compares Israel with 'the dust of the earth,' xiii.16, xxviii.14, or the 'sand of the sea,' xxxii.12;—never with the 'stars of heaven.'

(viii) *v.*6, 'and He reckoned it to him as righteousness';

*comp.* 'and it shall be to us as righteousness,' D.vi.25;

'and it shall be to thee as righteousness,' D.xxiv.13.

(ix) *v.*7, 'I am Jehovah, which brought thee out, &c.,' as in D.i.27, iv.20,37, v.15, vi.12,21,23, vii.8,19, viii.14, ix.12,26,28,29, xiii.5,10, xvi.1, xxvi.8, xxix.25, and also E.xx.2, L.xix.36,xxv.38,xxvi.13: and *similar*, though not *identical*, phrases occur in numerous passages of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, of which some are certainly D. interpolations). But in Genesis no identical or similar phrase occurs in any other passage than the verse before us; from which it may be inferred that, though *very common with the Deuteronomist*, the formula in question was *not* a favourite phrase with the *Jehovist*, or with any other of the principal writers of Genesis.

(x) *v.*7, 'give to thee the land to inherit it,' D.iii.18, v.28, xix.2,14, xxi.1: *similar, not identical*, expressions occur in G.xxviii.4(E), L.xx.24, N.xxxiii.53.

(xi) *v.*12, אֵימָה, 'terror,' D.xxxii.25, Jo.ii.9(D), also E.xv.16,xxiii.27.

(xii) *v.*13, 'a land not theirs (לֹא לָהֶם)'; *comp.* D.xxxii.17, 'not gods,' *v.*21, 'not god.'

(xiii) *v.*16, 'Amorites' used in a general sense for 'Canaanite,' D.i.7,19,20,27, Jo.v.1,vii.7,x.5,6,12,xxiv.15,18, all *D.* passages—also G.xlviii.22(J).

(xiv) *v.*18, 'cut a covenant' as *always* in Deuteronomy, v.2,3, vii.2, xxix.1,1,12, 14, xxxi.16, Jo.ix.6,7,11,15,16(D),—also J(126.ii).

(xv) *v.*18, 'from the river of Egypt *unto the great river, the river Euphrates*,' as in D.i.7, Jo.i.4(D); *comp.* 'from the river, the river Euphrates,' D.xi.24.

(xvi) *v.*19–21, *comp.* the list of Canaanitish nations in D.vii.1,xx.17, Jo.iii.10. ix.1, xxiv.11—all, most probably, Deuteronomistic passages.

(xvii) the fiery appearance in *v.*17,—the 'smoking furnace and burning lamps,' which passed between the pieces as the symbol of the Divine Presence—corresponds also to the D. peculiarity noticed in (III.546.vi), as indicated in D.iv.11,12,15,33,36, v.4,5,22,23,24,25,26, ix.10,15, x.4, xviii.16, xxxiii.2.

80. We read in *v.*2, 'and the heir (בֶּן־מֶשֶׁק) of my house is this Damascene (דַּמֶּשֶׂק);' and there is generally supposed to be here a play upon the sounds 'ben-*meshek*,' 'dam*mesek*.' If so, this might account for *Damascus* being named here at all. The writer wishes to introduce a vision, with a promise of an heir to Abram: and the unusual expression for *heir*, which he here employs, (and which occurs nowhere else in the Bible,) was, perhaps, suggested by its resemblance to the name 'Damascus,' which had occurred in the preceding context as it lay before him, xiv.15, at the end of which he determines to insert his own section. But the phrase 'ben-meshek' was, apparently, so unusual or antiquated, that in *v.*3 he himself explains it by repeating 'one born in my house will inherit me.'

81. This seems to be the true explanation of the repetition in *v.*3, which BOEHMER ascribes to the later Compiler, *p.*199:—

It is not very likely that the writer of this chapter in his own time believed that he had expressed himself so indistinctly as to need to explain himself. Nor is it probable that he himself wished to give the correct explanation of that punning speech of Abram, which had then already passed into a proverb in the mouth of the people; at all events, he does not explain to us other strange formulæ, *e.g.* xx.16. The simplest assumption is to regard *v.*3, which interrupts the progress of the narrative, as an interpolation of the Compiler, which, however, is right enough as to the fact.

*Ans.* We do not suppose that Abram's 'punning speech' had passed into a proverb, or was ever really uttered. The whole story seems to us to be manifestly due to the mere imagination of the writer.

82. HUPFELD, we have seen, regards *v.*13–16 as of later origin. BOEHMER assigns *v.*12–17[a] to his 'Compiler' of Josiah's time, and writes as follows, *p.*200, &c.

That *v.*13–16 does not really belong to the narrative of C[*i.e.* $E_2$, to whom BOEHMER assigns the main part of this chapter,] we regard as certain, and, as we shall presently show, not merely because the reference to the Egyptian servitude is here

quite out of place. Nor can it have been taken from either of the other two documents [E and J], in which it finds no fitting point of connection—at all events, between the portions of them in xiii on the one side and xvi on the other; and yet between these chapters it would have to take its place with equal reason for each of them, if the order of the narrative in those two documents has been retained here by the Compiler.

With *v.*13–16, however, must be taken out also *v.*12 and *v.*17ª. If these belong to the original text, then Abram,—who in a waking state had spoken with God, had been led out by Him under the starry heavens, had procured and slaughtered the animals, had kept off the vultures from them,—would just exactly *not* have seen with waking eyes the very climax of the act of making the covenant, *viz.* the passage of the fiery appearance between the pieces of the animals. This 'passage,' however, is just as much real and actual as is the division of the animals. It would surely be very surprising if this chief point was presented only in a *vision*, after God had provided everything in the actual outer world for a real procedure. Were we to suppose, however, that Abram had waked up again before that appearance took place, then the notice, that he had meanwhile been sleeping for a time, from shortly before sunset till the sun had actually set, and in this sleep had endured great terror, would be quite useless and superfluous. This sleeping can only have been mentioned for this reason, that the Compiler did not suppose that God in reality passed through the pieces—that could only have been a vision of Abraham's,—and so there happened also something superhuman and supremely holy, and revealed itself in the terror which fell on Abram, and in the unusual darkness even before sun-down. What is said about the going-down of the sun becomes subject to suspicion as an interpolation, from the fact that, according to the preceding narrative, we should rather have supposed that Abram had at once, during the night, as soon as God had given him the charge under the free sky, procured and slaughtered the proper animals. It strikes one as strange, after reading attentively up to this point, that it is suddenly said, 'and the Sun was about to go-down.' Was, then, all the rest of that night, and the whole of the next day, needed, in order to procure the five animals, and to divide the heifer, she-goat, and ram, into halves? Not a word is said about any further preparation of them, about eviscerating and burning them. Probably the Compiler had made the sober reflection that all this could not have happened so speedily, and that a day, therefore, must have passed before that appearance of fire passed between the pieces, which, however, had happened probably by night, as God also in the desert appeared only by night as a pillar of fire. The word תַּרְדֵּמָה, 'deep slumber,' occurs only once again in the Pentateuch in G.ii.21. But to infer from this fact only that in both passages the same author must be writing, would be a very mechanical kind of criticism. The spirit and connection of this section is decisive against this; and, even if the chapter were wholly from one hand, we should have here a different author from there. From that passage, however, this not very usual word may have remained in the recollection of the Compiler, and so have come to his pen. The prediction about the distinct Egyptian period stands here quite outside this noble

story of Abram's belief in God's promise of a son and a multitudinous offspring. Why Abram should be exactly informed that his descendants will spend 400 years in Egypt, is not very plain. It seems as if this insertion of the duration of the Egyptian sojourn had been suggested by a peculiar interpretation of the animals being commanded to be taken 'three-years old.' DELITZSCH thinks that this points to the three centuries of servitude in a strange land . . . By the analogy of the dreams in G.xl,xli, these three centuries would rather be denoted by the three animals, and not by their being each three-years old . . . Another sign of a different hand from that of the original writer is the fact that in *v.*16 only the *Amorites* are named as a Canaanitish people, that should be subdued under the children of Israel; whereas in *v.*19–21 is set forth the prospect of *ten* peoples being subjected to them, among whom the Amorites are named only as one of many.

83. The very fact that BOEHMER is dissatisfied with HUPFELD'S suggestion, that only *v.*13–16 is of later origin, and finds it necessary to ascribe *v.*12–17[a] to the Compiler, confirms strongly our view that the whole chapter belongs to the later editor. For the story as left by BOEHMER is liable to this objection, that, if the whole took place at *night*,—and clearly the 'smoking furnace and burning lamp' in *v.*17[b] are meant to pass through in the *darkness*, not in bright daylight—then there was no occasion for Abram to keep off the vultures from the carcases, *v.*11.

We see no reason, then, to divide the chapter at all. Probably, $E_2$ or J would have said in *v.*10, according to his usual style, after a Divine vision or dream, xx.8,xxi.14,xxii.3,xxviii.18,—

'*and Abram rose-up early in the morning*, and he took to him all these, &c.'

But the writer, according to our view, supposes that Abram did not take and slaughter the animals in the *night*, but in the day-time, and clearly the whole morning after the vision might be supposed to be spent in this work. Then, during the afternoon, he watched the pieces till towards sun-down, when a deep sleep fell upon him, out of which he *waked* in a state of terror, to find himself in thick darkness. In this state the voice reached him with the words of *v.*13–16, which, taken in connection with *v.*7, contain the terms of the covenant then made by Jehovah with Abram. And then, in ratification of the covenant, the fiery appearance—the Deuteronomistic emblem of the Deity—passes through the pieces. The statement in *v.*18–21 seems to

be rather a recapitulation of the promise in *v.*7, enlarged by the writer into a full description of the tribes of Canaan, than to contain the very terms of the covenant.

84. Thus the whole chapter appears to us to have proceeded from one pen. And, if so, since according to BOEHMER, *v.*13–16, or rather *v.*12–17$^{a}$, cannot possibly belong to E, or $E_2$, or J, but must be assigned to the later Editor, we are strongly confirmed in the conclusion that the whole chapter belongs to him—that is, to the *Deuteronomist*, of whose hand we have seen so many indications in the analysis (79). The very fact that in *v.*16 'Amorite' *is* used as a general name for all the inhabitants of Canaan, is an additional argument for the Deut. origin of the passage; since in only one other passage of the Pentateuch, *viz.* G.xlviii.22, is 'Amorite' thus used, except in Deuteronomy or in Deuteronomistic parts of Joshua; and so upon D.i.7,19,20, KEIL notes, *Deut.* *p.*395—

The 'mountain of the Amorites' is . . of like significance with the following 'land of the Canaanites;' since the Amorites are named as the then mightiest people of Canaan, *instar omnium*, as in G.xv.16.

85. xvi.1,3,15,16, *Elohist.*

DELITZSCH observes, *p.*643, that this chapter is—

Jehovistic, but with a still recognisable Elohistic basis, especially *v.*3,15,16.

HUPFELD and BOEHMER give also to E only *v.*3,15,16. But it appears to me that *v.*1 also belongs to him; and such is the judgment of ILGEN.

(i) *v.*1, 'and Sarai, Abram's wife, did not bear *to him*,' see (58.v.N.B.)

(ii) *v.*1, 'Sarai, Abram's wife,' as in *v.*3, but 'Sarai,' simply, in *v.*2,5,6,8.

(iii) *v.*1, 'and she had a maid *an* Egyptian, and her name Hagar,' seems distinctly referred to in *v.*3, 'Sarai took Hagar *the* Egyptian, her maid,' and xxv.12, 'Hagar, *the* Egyptian, Sarah's maid.'

N.B. HUPFELD says, p.25, note, that the formula וּשְׁמָהּ, 'and her name,' is found only in J. passages, xxii.24, xxv.1, xxviii.6, *comp.* 'and his name,' xxiv.29, xxxviii.1,2. This is true; but this single fact does not seem sufficient to mark it as *peculiar* to the Jehovist. We have very similar phrases in xxxvi.32,35,39,39, and *comp.* וּשְׁמִי, 'and my name,' E.vi.3.

(iv) J has already prematurely mentioned Sarai's barrenness, xi.30, with

different forms of expression, 'Sarai was barren,' 'there was *to her* no child,' and needed not to mention it again; *comp.* xxix.31(J.) with xxx.1ᵃ, which we give to E.

(v) *v.3*, date of Abram's taking Hagar to wife, (10.vii).

*(vi) *v.3*, 'at the end of Abram's dwelling 10 years in the land of Canaan,' refers to xiii.12ᵃ, 'Abram dwelt in the land of Canaan.'

N.B. *v.3*, as it now stands, is superfluous, since it only repeats what is said in *v.2*. In reality, however, it is *v.2*, which has been interpolated into the original document. HUPFELD says, p. 24: '*v.3* is quite superfluous and disturbing in this connection; since it only repeats generally, as a bare fact, what was detailed at length in the preceding verse, *viz.* Sarai's proposal, with the motive for it, and Abram's acceptance of it.'

(vii) *v.15*, 'and Hagar bare *to Abram* a son,' *v.16*, 'at Hagar's bearing Ishmael to Abram,' (58.v.N.B.).

(viii) *v.16*, date of Ishmael's birth, (10.vii).

*(ix) *v.16*, the 'eighty-six' years refers to the 'ten years' of *v.3* and the 'seventy-five years' of xii.4ᵇ, which are therefore all thus coupled together.

## 86. xvi.2,4–14, *Jehovist.*

*(i) *v.2*, הִנֶּה־נָא, 'behold, I pray!' (59.xv).

*(ii) *v.2*, אוּלַי, 'perhaps,' xvi.2, xviii.24,28,29,30,31,32, xxiv.5,39, xxvii.12, xxxii.20(21), xliii.12.

*(iii) בּוֹא, 'go in,' used of sexual intercourse, xvi.4, xix.31,33, xxix.21,23,30, xxx.3,4ᵇ,16, xxxviii.2,8,9,16,18.

(iv) *v.4,5*, קָלַל, 'be light,' as in viii.8,11.

*(v) *v.5*, 'my wrong on thee!' *comp.* 'on me thy curse!' xxvii.13.

*(vi) *v.6*, עָשָׂה לְ־, 'do to,' (47.ix).

(vii) *v.6*, 'be good in the eyes of,' xvi.6, xix.8, xxxiv.18, 'be evil in the eyes of,' xxxi.35, xxxviii.7,10:

E has it also, xxviii.8, and $E_2$, xx.15, xxi.11,12.

*(viii) *v.6,9*, עָנָה, 'afflict,' xvi.6,9, xxxi.50, xxxiv.2, *comp.* עֳנִי 'affliction,' xvi.11, xxix.32ᵉ, xxxi.42, xli.52.

*(ix) *v.6,8*, בָּרַח, 'flee,' xvi.6,8, xxvii.43, xxxi.20,21,22,27, xxxv.1,7.

(x) *v.10*, 'multiplying I will multiply,' as in iii.16.

(xi) *v.10*, 'it shall not be counted for multitude,' as in xxxii.12, (63.xxv).

*(xii) *v.11*, 'thou shalt call his name Ishmael,' (יִשְׁמָעֵאל) *for* Jehovah hath hearkened (שָׁמַע) unto thy affliction,'—the name 'Ishmael' derived as in (3.xvi).

N.B. DELITZSCH says, *p.*377, 'We have here *Jehovah*, where *Elohim* would have been most natural,'—that is, we have 'thou shalt call his name Ishmael (=El hears), for *Jehovah* hath heard, &c.,' where we might have expected 'for *Elohim* hath heard, &c.' The fact seems to be that the Jehovist here takes up the name Ishmael,' which E had introduced in *v.15* without an explanation, (though he makes an allusion to its meaning afterwards in xvii.20,) and according to his wont has derived it; but instead of the name here required, 'Elohim,' he has inadvertently used the name 'Jehovah.'

*(xiii) *v.*12, 'and eastward of all his brethren shall he abide,' (58.i).

*(xiv) *v.*12, שָׁכַן, 'abide,' (4.xxvii).

*(xv) *v.*13, 'and she called the name, &c. *for* &c.,' derivation, as in (3.xvi).

(xvi) *v.*13, 'do I also *see* (= live) after my *seeing* (Jehovah or the angel of Jehovah)?' a Jehovistic play on words.

*(xvii) *v.*14, 'therefore (עַל־כֵּן) one called,' &c., derivation as in (55.xii).

87. BOEHMER gives *v.*8–10 to the Compiler, and writes, *p.*203:—

The Compiler, who had afterwards to communicate another account of the extrusion of Hagar, G.xxi, from the pen of C($E_2$), must here, in this account of B(J), make the maid return again from her flight. It is he, therefore, (which fact even HUPFELD has not observed,) who adds after the statement, that the Angel had found her in the wilderness, *v.*7, the words in *v.*8,9, 'And he said &c.'

Also the promise of a numerous posterity, *v.*10,—before even a word had been said about the son to be first expected,—is loosely inserted before the prediction concerning him in *v.*11,12.

88. We see no reason to suppose that *v.*8,9, is not from the hand of the original (Jehovistic) author; though there is no characteristic feature of his style to be observed in it.

As to *v.*10, the triple repetition of the formula 'and the angel of Jehovah said unto her,' in three consecutive verses is somewhat peculiar; as is also the anomaly, noticed above by BOEHMER, *viz.* that we have here a numerous progeny promised to Hagar, *before* her immediate son is spoken of. Still there seems no sufficient reason for withdrawing this verse from J.

89. BOEHMER, however, wishing to secure for $E_2$ an independent account of the birth of Ishmael, assigns to him *v.*2 and *v.*15$^a$, 'and Hagar bare to Abram a son,' writing as follows, *p.*111:—

The narrative of the extrusion of the son of the maid in consequence of the birth of Isaac in xxi.9, &c., [which BOEHMER ascribes, as we do, to $E_2$,] implies that this author has already spoken of him. Since, then, xvi.2 is not required for J, it may be questioned whether we do not possess the required notice in this verse together with *v.*15$^a$, which the Elohist can give up. Perhaps the Compiler has set שִׁפְחָה in *v.*2, instead of אָמָה which $E_2$ uses in xx.17, xxi.10, &c., because the former both preceded and followed here, in the composite story which he had compiled, xvi.1,3. The name 'Ishmael,' the ground of which is first given [by this writer] in xxi.17, is not here mentioned.

*Ans.* (i) $E_2$ did *not*, according to our view, write an original independent narrative,

but wrote merely to supplement the story of E, and therefore assumed facts already stated in E, xvi.1,3,15,16, to which he refers in xxi.9, &c.

(ii) It seems impossible to believe that either in $E_2$ *v.*15$^a$ can have followed *v.*2, without *v.*4$^a$ intervening, and without also *v.*15$^b$ completing the notice, or that in E *v.*15$^b$ can have followed *v.*3 without *v.*15$^a$ intervening.

(iii) *v.*15, 'and Hagar bare to Abram a son, and Abram called his son's name, whom Hagar bare, Ishmael,' corresponds exactly with the E passage, xxi.2,3, 'and Sarah . . . bare to Abraham a son, . . . and Abraham called his son's name . . . whom Sarah bare to him, Isaac.'

(iv) The difficulty here noticed by BOEHMER is a strong argument *against* the idea that $E_2$ wrote a complete independent narrative.

(v) Most probably there is an allusion to the name *Ishmael* = 'El hears' in the words of xxi.17($E_2$), 'Elohim hath heard &c.' But, if $E_2$ had written an independent narrative, he would surely have given *here*—or *somewhere*, at all events—the name itself; whereas it occurs nowhere in $E_2$; though the writer, as we have said, alludes to it, apparently, in xxi.17, as already known from xvi.15,16.

90. It will be observed that in xi–xvi everywhere the names 'Abram' and 'Sarai' are used in *Jehovistic* passages, and not 'Abraham' and 'Sarah,' till *after* xvii.5,15, where the *Elohist* introduces these changes of name. This, of course, is easily explained on our supposition, that the Jehovist, &c., wrote merely to *supplement* the previously existing story of the Elohist—in which case they would merely follow his lead. But it raises a difficulty for those who maintain that the Jehovist wrote an *independent* narrative, especially as we have to account for 'Abram' appearing also in xiv, which both HUPFELD and BOEHMER assign to another older writer,—the latter giving it, as we have seen, to C($E_2$). Accordingly, it is supposed, HUPF. *p.*198,199, BOEHM. *p.*197, that the *Compiler* made the necessary changes in the original documents, where 'Abraham' and 'Sarah' must have been at first written, in order to get rid of the glaring discrepancy, which would have otherwise existed between them and the Elohistic narrative.

91. HUPFELD however writes, *p.*199:

That one compiler has not done this with the Divine Name *throughout* Genesis, and neither corrected the 'Elohim' of the older documents after the 'Jehovah' of the latest, nor corrected this last by the former, but has left to each document its own name, may be explained from this, that in the later phraseology also both

names existed together, and seemed therefore equally justified, and 'Elohim' might be supposed to have been employed for distinct subjective reasons, so that he could not venture to alter it.

Accordingly BOEHMER supposes that the Jehovist in ii.4$^{b}$–iii.24 did not write originally 'Jehovah-Elohim,' but simply 'Jehovah,' and the Compiler added the 'Elohim,' in order to show that the 'Jehovah' of the new narrative was identical with the 'Elohim' of i.1–ii.4$^{a}$.

It seems to me that, if the Compiler really had changed the 'Abraham' and 'Sarah' of the original J. matter in xi–xvi into 'Abram' and 'Sarai,' in order to get rid of the inconsistency of using names which (according to the Elohist) *had not yet been given,* he would most probably have altered everywhere 'Jehovah' into 'Elohim,' in order to avoid the far greater inconsistency of making the patriarchs use freely a name, which (according to the Elohist) *had not yet been revealed.*

92. xvii.1–27.

This chapter is full of Elohistic peculiarities, as will be seen from the following analysis; and the name 'Elohim' occurs in it *ten* times. But in *v.*1 we find the name 'Jehovah,' the only instance of its being used in the whole chapter, or, indeed, in the whole Elohistic portion of Genesis. This phenomenon has perplexed all critical commentators. HUPFELD observes, *p.*27 :—

There remains thus the strange name 'Jehovah' in *v.*1, which I certainly know not how to explain otherwise than by having recourse to the doubtful assumption—often beyond all question applied improperly by TUCH and others,—that 'Ihvh' has here slipped in instead of the original 'Elohim,' which may, perhaps, be explained here from the fact, that the formula 'and Ihvh appeared &c.,' is so common in J. passages, xii.7, xviii.1, xxvi.2,24, E.iii.2, &c.

BOEHMER, however, writes, *p.*22 :—

'Jahveh' need not here be an interpolation. For from the fact that, in the view of this writer, the name was unknown before the time of Moses, E.vi.3, it does not follow that, living, as he did, long afterwards, he may not have employed it in the pre-Mosaic history, without contradicting himself. He seems, indeed, to have done it purposely, in order to refer back expressly the rite of circumcision, on

which, as is well known, great stress was laid in opposition to the Philistines, [1S.xiv.6, xvii.26,36,] to the very same God, who also gave to His people the Mosaic Law.'

It seems to me impossible to accept BOEHMER'S solution of the difficulties. Surely if his view were true, we must then expect to find the name 'Jahveh' used throughout this important chapter,—or, at all events, in *v.*9, where the covenant of circumcision is laid down,—and not 'Elohim' everywhere.

93. With HUPFELD, therefore, I conclude that the original text is here corrupted. The name 'Jehovah' may have 'slipt in,' by an *oversight* on the part of the original writer, (who was himself in the habit of using it in his own day,) or by an interpolation of a later Compiler or Editor, or by a mere *error of transcription*. The proper formula of the Elohist is seen in xxxv.9, 'and Elohim appeared unto Jacob,' identical with that before us, except in respect of the Divine Name. Since, therefore, 'Elohim' is found everywhere else (*ten* times) in this chapter, it seems most probable that it stood originally in *v.*1, and has been changed somehow to Jehovah, most probably, as we have said, by the mere inadvertence of a copyist, more accustomed to the Jehovistic form. *In fact, the 'Elohim' in v.*3 *evidently presupposes 'Elohim' also in v.*1.

94. That this chapter, however, is certainly Elohistic, is distinctly recognised by DELITZSCH, though writing strongly from the traditionary point of view, *p.*644:

'This chapter is Elohistic, with a Jehovistic connection to the foregoing, which may be recognised by the Divine Name, 'Jehovah,' in *v.*1, but is otherwise not separable by any external indications. It is, in fact, *the Elohistic model-section*, uniting in itself nearly all the peculiarities of the E. diction and historical style.'

And HUPFELD also observes, *p.*26:—

'By means of the recovered fragments of the original document, [xii.4$^b$,5,xiii.6,12$^a$, xvi.1,3,15,16,] which with all brevity relate the chief points of that which forms the subject of ample embellishment and variation in the more circumstantial narrative of the Jehovist, (whence we derive an instructive indication of the relation of the two sources to each other,) the following section of the theocratic history in G.xvii, the Call of Abraham, or the theocratic promise made to him, is also

sufficiently provided for in the original document, since all, which is therein referred to, has been mentioned already.'

95. G.xvii.1–27, *Elohist.*

We have here the E. account of God's making a covenant with Abraham, and giving him a promise of great blessings, which last, as noted in (62), the Jehovist has already anticipated in xii.1–3, where he makes Jehovah give such promises to Abram about twenty-four years previously, before he had even left his fatherland of Charran.

*(i) *v.*1, 'and Abram was a son of 99 years,' refers to xvi.16.

(ii) *v.*1, date of the Call of Abraham (10.vii).

(iii) *v.*1, אֲנִי 'I,' (19.ix).

(iv) *v.*1, 'and He said unto him, I am El Shaddai';

*comp.* 'and Elohim said to him, I am El Shaddai,' xxxv.11;

'and He said unto him, I am Jehovah, and I appeared . . . by El Shaddai,' E.vi.2,3;

*comp.* also 'El Shaddai' in xxviii.3, xlviii.3.

J has also 'El Shaddai,' xliii.14, xlix.25.

*(v) *v.*1, 'be perfect (תְּמִים)'; *comp.* 'Noah was perfect,' vi.9.

*(vi) *v.*2, 'I will (give) set my covenant between me and thee';

*comp.* 'the covenant which I am setting between me and thee,' ix.12.

*(vii) *v.*2, 'give a covenant,' (46.xxv).

*(viii) *v.*2,4, &c. 'my covenant,' (19.xiii).

*(ix) *v.*2, 'I will very greatly *multiply* thee,' + *v.*6, 'I will very greatly *fructify* thee,' = 'I will very greatly *multiply and fructify* thee';

*comp.* פָּרָה וְרָבָה 'fructify and multiply,' (1.ix).

*(x) *v.*2,6,20, בִּמְאֹד מְאֹד, 'exceedingly,' xvii.2,6,20, E.i.7.

*(xi) *v.*3,22,23, 'speak with (אֵת),' xvii.3,22,23, xxi.2, xxiii.8, xxxv.13,14,15;

E uses also 'speak unto (אֶל),' xxiii.3,13, never 'speak with (עִם)' or 'speak to (לְ)':

In the rest of Genesis all four forms occur, but that with אֶל *twenty-two* times, and that with אֵת *six* times, while E uses the latter *eight* times and the former *twice.*

*(xii) *v.*4, 'thou shalt be father of a *multitude of nations*';

*comp.* 'a father of a *multitude of nations* will I (give) set thee,' xvii.5;

'I will (give) set thee for *nations*, and *kings* shall go-forth out of thee,' xvii.6;

'she shall be for *nations*; *kings of peoples* shall be out of her,' xvii.16;

'*twelve princes* shall he beget, and I will (give) set him for a *great nation*,' xvii.20;

'that thou mayest be for a *company of peoples*,' xxviii.3;

'a *nation* and a *company of nations* shall be out of thee, and *kings* shall go-forth out of thy loins,' xxxv.11;

'and I will (give) set thee for a *company of peoples*,' xlviii.4.

(xiii) *v.5*, 'thy name shall not be called any longer *Abram* (אַבְרָם, = 'high father'); but thy name shall be called *Abraham* (אַבְרָהָם); for a *father of a multitude* (אַב הֲמוֹן) of nations do I (give) set thee'; the name 'Abraham' derived indirectly;

*comp.* similar indirect Elohistic derivations by allusion, xvii.15,17,20, xxv.25,26, xxx.8$^e$,11,13,18$^e$,20$^e$,24$^a$, and the notes on these passages.

*(xiv) *v.6*, 'kings shall go-forth out of thee';

*comp.* 'kings shall go-forth out of thy loins,' xxxv.11;

'the souls that went-forth out of his thigh,' xlvi.26;

'the souls that went-forth out of Jacob's thigh,' E.i.5.

*(xv) *v.7*, 'and I establish my covenant *between* me and thy seed after thee';

*comp.* 'and I will establish my covenant *with* you and your seed after you,' ix.9.

N.B. E uses בֵּין in ix.12,13,17, xvii.2,7,10,11, and אֵת in ix.9, xvii.4,21.

*(xvi) *v.7,19,21*, 'establish a covenant,' (19.xii).

*(xvii) *v.7,8,9*, 'thou and thy seed after thee,' *v.10*, 'you and thy seed after thee,' *v.19*, 'he and his seed after him,' (46.xviii).

*(xviii) *v.7,9,12*, 'after their (your) generations,' (19.ii).

(xix) *v.7,13,19*, 'everlasting covenant,' (46.xxvi).

(xx) *v.7*, 'to be to thee for Elohim,' *v.8*, 'and I will be to them for Elohim';

*comp.* 'and I will be to you for Elohim,' E.vi.7:—also J(xxviii.21).

*(xxi) *v.8*, 'and I will give to thee (Abraham) and to thy seed after thee, the land of thy sojournings, all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession';

*comp.* 'that he may give to thee the blessing of Abraham, to thee and to thy seed with thee, to thy inheriting the land of thy sojournings, which Elohim gave to Abraham,' xxviii.4;

'and the land, which I gave to Abraham and to Isaac, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed after thee will I give the land,' xxxv.12;

'to give to them the land of their sojournings, in which they sojourned, E.vi.4.

N.B. There is no record of any appearance of El Shaddai to *Isaac*, and Isaac's own language in xxviii.4(E), quoted above, seems to exclude the idea that any such appearance had been related by the Elohist—'and may He (El Shaddai) give thee the *blessing of Abraham*, to thee and to thy seed after thee, that thou mayest inherit *the land which Elohim gave to Abraham*,'—where the gift of the land is spoken of as 'the blessing of Abraham,' but no mention is made of the land having been given by direct revelation to Isaac *himself*. Apparently, therefore, the land is spoken of in xxxv.12, quoted above, as 'given' to Isaac, because it was given to him in the 'blessing of Abraham,' xxviii.4, by virtue of the words 'to thee and to *thy seed* after thee,' xvii.8, and especially by virtue of those in xvii.19, 'Indeed,' Sarah thy wife shall bear to thee a son, and thou shalt call his name Isaac; and *I establish my covenant with him*, for an everlasting covenant to his seed after him.'

*(xxii) *v.8*, 'land of thy sojournings,' xxviii.4;

*comp.* 'land of their sojournings,' xxxvi.7;

'land of his father's sojournings,' xxxvii.1;

'years of my sojournings,' xlvii.9;
'days of their sojournings,' xlvii.9;
'land of their sojournings, in which they sojourned,' E.vi.4.

*(xxiii) *v.*8, אֲחֻזָּה, 'possession,' xvii.8,xxiii.4,9,20,xxxvi.43,xlvii.11,xlviii.4,l.13.

*(xxiv) *v.*10, 'between me and between you and between thy seed after thee';
*comp.* 'between me and between you and between every living soul that is with you,' ix.12.

*(xxv) *v.*11, 'and it shall be for a sign of a covenant between me and you;'
*comp.* 'and it shall be for a sign of a covenant between me and the earth,' ix.13.

*(xxvi) *v.*11, 'sign of a covenant,' as in ix.12,17.

(xxvii) *v.*14, 'that soul shall be *cut off* from his people';
*comp.* 'all flesh shall not be again *cut off*,' ix.11.

(xxviii) *v.*14, נֶפֶשׁ, 'soul,' used for 'person,' (60.vii).

(xxix) *v.*15, 'as for Sarai thy wife, thou shalt not call her name *Sarai* (שָׂרָי = 'my princess'); for *Sarah* (שָׂרָה, 'princess') is her name'—an indirect derivation of the name 'Sarah,' with allusion, probably, to *v.*16, '*kings* of peoples shall be out of her,' (95.xiii).

(xxx) *v.*17, 'and Abraham fell upon his face and *laughed*,' with allusion to the name *Isaac* (יִצְחָק = 'he laughs'), by which the promised son is to be called, *v.*19, apparently in remembrance of this 'laughing,' (95.xiii).

(xxxi) *v.*17, 'and Abraham fell upon his face,' as in *v.*3.

(xxxii) *v.*17, 'and said in his heart,' as in xxvii.41(J); *comp.* also 'said unto his heart,' viii.21(J), 'speaking unto my heart,' xxiv.45(J); neither of these formulæ occurs again in the Pentateuch.

(xxxiii) *v.*17, מֵאָה, 'hundred,' as in xxiii.1; elsewhere E has מְאַת (10.ix).

(xxxiv) *v.*17, ages of Abraham and Sarah at Isaac's birth (10.vii).

(xxxv) *v.*18, 'would that Ishmael might live before thee!' refers to the birth of Ishmael, xvi.15 (E).

(xxxvi) *v.*20, 'as for Ishmael, I have heard thee,'—with allusion to the name *Ishmael* (יִשְׁמָעֵאל = 'El hears,' (95.xiii);
*comp.* also the Jehovistic derivation of the name in xvi.11.

(xxxvii) *v.*20, נָשִׂיא, 'prince,' xvii.20, xxiii.6, xxv.16,—also J(xxxiv.2).

*(xxxviii) *v.*20, הוֹלִיד, 'beget,' (10.viii).

(xxxix) *v.*22, 'and Elohim went-up from Abraham';
*comp.* 'and Elohim went-up from him,' xxxv.13.

*(xl) *v.*23,26, 'on the bone of that day' = on that selfsame day, vii.13, xvii.23,26.

(xli) *v.*24,25, dates of the circumcision of Abraham and Ishmael, (10.vii).

*(xlii) *v.*27, 'with (אֵת) him,' as a kind of expletive, (19.xiv).

## 96. xviii.1–33.

BOEHMER remarks, *p.*203, that the name 'Abraham' is—
missing in this verse, which could not properly be absent after xvi.11–14.

He means to say that, in the original *independent* narrative of J, xviii.1 must have followed xvi.11–14, and therefore must have contained a mention of Abraham's name.

Accordingly, it may be suggested that the Compiler has left it out either *accidentally* or *purposely*.

*Accidentally* he could not have left it out of the verse; since a *substitute*, 'appeared unto *him*,' is given in *v.*1 for 'appeared *unto Abraham*.' And what possible reason can be given for his having designedly omitted it and inserted this equivalent?

It may be said, however, that a whole Jehovistic *section* may have been omitted, at the end of which the name appeared, to which the reference is made in *v.*1. This is certainly possible: but our own view is that the Jehovist has merely *supplemented* the original story by interpolating this passage, with reference to the next-preceding words of the *Elohist* in xvii.24–27.

97. xviii.1–33, *Jehovist*, except *v.*18,19.

(i) *v.*1, 'and Jehovah appeared unto him,' (59.vi).

(ii) *v.*1, 'by the terebinths of Mamre,' as in xiii.18.

(iii) *v.*1, 'heat of the day;' *comp.* 'cool (*lit.* wind) of the day,' iii.8.

*(iv) *v.*2, 'lift up the eyes and see,' (63.xv).

*(v) *v.*2, נִצָּב, 'stand-up,' xviii.2, xxiv.13,43, xxviii.13, xxxvii.7, xlv.1; *comp.* xxi.28, xxviii.12, xxxiii.20, xxxv.14,20.

*(vi) *v.*2, נִצָּב עַל, 'stand beside,' xviii.2, xxiv.13,43, xxviii.13, xlv.1.

*(vii) *v.*2, 'ran to meet,' xviii.2, xxiv.17, xxix.13, xxxiii.4; *comp.* 'rose to meet,' xix.1, 'went-out to meet,' xxx.16, 'come to meet,' xxxii.6, 'go-up to meet.' xlvi.29.

*(viii) *v.*2, 'ran to meet,' *comp.* 'ran to draw,' xxiv.20, 'ran and told,' xxiv.28,xxix.12.

*(ix) *v.*2, 'bow to the earth,' xviii.2, xix.1, xxiv.52, xxxiii.3, xxxvii.10, xliii.26, xlviii.12.

*(x) *v.*3, 'thy servant,' *v.*5, 'your servant,' *comp.* xviii.3,5, xix.2,19, xxiv.14, xxvi.24, xxxii.4,10,18,20, xxxiii.5,14, xlii.10,11,13, xliii.28, xliv.7,9,16,18,18,19,21, 23,24,27,30,31,31,32,33, xlvi.34, xlvii.3,4,4, l.18.

*(xi) *v.*3, 'if, I pray, (אִם־נָא) I have found favour in thine eyes,' xviii.3, xxx.27, xxxiii.10, xlvii.29, l.4.

(xii) *v.*3, 'find favour in the eyes of,' (13.xii).

*(xiii) *v.*3,30,32, אַל־נָא, 'let not, I pray,' (63.xii).

*(xiv) *v.*4, 'a little water,' as in xxiv.17,43; *comp.* 'a little food,' xliii.2, xliv.25, 'a little balm,' 'a little honey,' xliii.11.

*(xv) *v.*4, 'wash your feet,' xviii.4, xix.2, xliii.24.

(xvi) *v.*5, עַל־כֵּן, 'therefore,' (3.xvii).

(xvii) *v.5*, 'so do according as thou hast spoken';
∴ *comp.* 'He did to Sarah according as He had spoken,' xxi.1;
'I have done, according as thou hast spoken,' xxvii.19.

(xviii) *v.*10,14, 'there shall be a son to Sarah,' (58.v.N.B.).

*(xix) *v.*11, 'and Abraham and Sarah were old, advanced in days';
*comp.* 'and Abraham was old, advanced in days,' xxiv.1.

(xx) *v.*12, 'and Sarah *laughed*,' *v.*13, 'why did Sarah *laugh*?' *v.*15, 'I *laughed* not,' 'thou didst *laugh*,' indirect derivation of the name Isaac (= he laughs), (3.iv).

*(xxi) *v.*12,24, בְּקֶרֶב, 'in the midst of,' xviii.12,24, xxiv.3, xxv.22, xlv.6, xlviii.16.
E uses only בְּתוֹךְ, i.6, xix.29, xxiii.6,9,10, which J also uses, ii.9, iii.3,8, &c.

*(xxii) *v.*14, פָּלָא מִן, 'be more wonderful than,' (5.xviii).

(xxiii) *v.*16, קוּם, 'arise,' = start, (63.xxv).

*(xxiv) *v.*16, שָׁקַף, 'look,' xviii.16, xix.28, xxv.8.

(xxv) *v.*16,22,26, 'Sodom,' *v.*20, 'Sodom and Gomorrah,' (50.xi).

(xxvi) *v.*17, 'And Jehovah said, Shall I hide from Abraham what I am doing?' *v.*20,21, 'and Jehovah said, The cry of Sodom, &c.';
*comp.* similar secret speeches ascribed to Jehovah (3.xii).

*(xxvii) *v.*20, וַעֲקָה, *v.*21, צַעֲקָה, 'cry,' xviii.20,21, xix.13, xxvii.34; *comp.* iv.10, 'the voice of thy brother's blood *crieth* unto me,' and צָעָק, 'cry,' xxvii.34, xli.55.

*(xxviii) *v.*20, כָּבֵד, 'heavy,' (59.xiv).

(xxix) *v.*21, 'let me go down and see;'
*comp.* 'Jehovah went down to see,' xi.5, 'let us go down,' xi.7.

*(xxx) *v.*21, אִם־לֹא, 'if not,' xviii.21, xxiv.8,21,38,41,49, xxvii.21, xxxiv.17 xxxvii.32, xlii.16,37.

*(xxxi) *v.*22, פָּנָה, 'face towards,' xviii.22, xxiv.31,49,63.

*(xxxii) *v.*23, נָגַשׁ, 'come-near,' xviii.23, xix.9,9, xxvii.21,22,25,25,26,27, xxix.10, xxxiii.3,6,7,7, xliii.19, xliv.18, xlv.4,4, xlviii.10,13.

(xxxiii) v.23,24, אַף, as in iii.1.

*(xxxiv) *v.*23,24, סָפָה, 'destroy,' as in xix.15,17.

*(xxxv) *v.*24,28,29,30,31,32, אוּלַי, 'perhaps,' (86.ii).

*(xxxvi) *v.*24,26, נָשָׂא, 'forgive,' (5.xix).

(xxxvii) *v.*24, לְמַעַן, 'in order to,' 'by reason of,' (59.xviii).

*(xxxviii) *v.*25,25, חָלִילָה, 'far be it,' xviii.24,25, xliv.7,17.

*(xxxix) *v.*25, 'according to this (word) thing,' xviii.25, xxxii.19;
*comp.* 'according to these (words) things,' xxiv.28, xxxix.17,19, xliv.7; *comp.* xxx.34, xliii.7, xliv.10, xlvii.30.

*(xl) *v.*25, הָמִית, 'put-to-death,' xviii.25, xxvi.11, xxxvii.18, xxxviii.7,10, xlii.37.

*(xli) *v.*26,29,31,32, בַּעֲבוּר, 'for the sake of,' (4.xviii).

*(xlii) *v.*27,31, הִנֵּה־נָא, 'behold, I pray!' (59.xv).

(xliii) *v.*27, עָפָר וָאֵפֶר, 'dust and ashes,'—alliteration as in (5.xvii).

*(xliv) *v.*29, 'add to speak,' (5.iv).

*(xlv) *v.*30,32, 'be kindled (*viz.* anger) to,' (5.viii).

*(xlvi) *v.*32, 'this time,' (3.xv).

*(xlvii) *v.*33, 'as he had finished to speak unto Abraham';

*comp.* 'and it came-to-pass as the camels had finished to drink,' xxiv.22;
'and it came-to-pass as Isaac had finished to bless Jacob,' xxvii.30;
'and it came-to-pass as they had finished to eat the corn,' xliii.2.

(xlviii) *strong anthropomorphisms* (3.xx), Jehovah being described as—

'eating,' *v.*8, *comp.* *v.*13,—rebuking Sarah, *v.*13,—contradicted by her, *v.*15,—reasoning within himself, *v.*17,20,21,—argued with by Abraham, *v.*23–32,—'going his way,' *v.*33.

98. xviii.18,19, *Deuteronomist.*

The change to the third person in *v.*19$^{b}$,—

'that Jehovah may bring upon Abraham what He hath spoken concerning him,'—

seems to imply that we have here an interpolation by a strange hand. This is confirmed by finding, as below, that *v.*18,19 betray strong Deuteronomistic features. Probably *v.*17 is part of the original story, *comp.* 'and Jehovah said,' *v.*13,20,26.

(i) *v.*18, 'he shall *become a nation great and mighty*';
*comp.* 'he *became* there *a nation great, mighty*, and numerous,' D.xxvi.5.

(ii) *v.*18, 'a nation great and mighty,' D.iv.38, vii.1, ix.1,14, xi.23, xxvi.5, Jo. xxiii.9(D), also N.xiv.12,—*nowhere else in the Bible.*

(iii) *v.*18, 'all nations of the earth,' G.xxii.18(D), xxvi.4(D), D.xxviii.1, Jer.xxvi.6, xxxiii.9, xliv.8, Zech.xii.3,—*nowhere else in the Bible.*

N.B. The *Jehovistic* phrase is 'all families of the ground,' xii.3, xxviii.14.

(iv) *v.*18, 'and by him shall be blessed all nations of the earth';
*comp.* 'and by thy seed shall bless themselves all nations of the earth,' xxii.18(D), xxvi.4(D);—where in both cases the Hithpael form of the verb is used, instead of the Niphal, as here, *v.*18, and in J(xii.3, xxviii.14), the type, probably, from which all the others are copied.

N.B. The converse idea occurs in Jer.xxvi.6, 'I will make this city *a curse to all nations of the earth*,' = 'all nations of the earth shall be cursed by it,' *i.e.* by using its name, by its being said 'Jehovah make thee (accursed) as Jerusalem!' *comp.* G.xlviii.20, 'By thee shall Israel bless, saying, Elohim make thee as Ephraim and as Manasseh!'

On the other hand, Jeremiah has also, xxxiii.9, 'It shall be to me *a name of joy*, a praise, and an honour, before *all nations of the earth*,' = 'all nations of the earth shall use its name in their formulas of blessing.'

(v) *v.*19, 'for I know,' as in D.xxxi.21,27,29, also G.xxii.12, E.iii.7, &c.

(vi) *v.*19,19, לְמַעַן, 'in order that,' D.ii.30, iii.26, iv.1,40, v.16,16,29, vi.2, viii.1, 2,3,16,16,18, ix.5, xi.9, xx.18, xxvii.3, xxix.9,18, xxx.6, Jo.i.8, iii.4, iv.6,24,24,—more frequently than in all the rest of the Pentateuch and Book of Joshua put together, *viz.* G.xii.13, xviii.24, xxvii.25, xxxvii.22, l.20, E.i.11, iv.5, viii.6,18, ix.16, x.1, xi.7,9, xiii.9, xvi.4,32, xx.12, xxiii.12, xxxiii.13, L.xvii.5, xx.3, N.xv.40, xvii.5:

the only places where it occurs twice in the same context are D.v.16,16, viii.16,16, Jo.iv.24,24, and the passage before us, G xviii.19,19.

(vii) *v.*19, לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר, G.xviii.19, L.xvii.5, N.xvii.5, D.xx.18, xxvii.3, Jo.iii.4.

*(viii) *v.*19, 'he shall command his children . . . and they shall observe . . . to do &c.';

*comp.* 'ye shall command your children to observe to do &c.,' D.xxxii.46;

*comp.* also 'teach them thy sons and thy son's sons,' D.iv.9;

'and that they may teach their children,' D.iv.10;

'and thou shalt teach them diligently to thy children,' D.vi.7;

'and ye shall teach them to your children,' D.xi.19.

*(ix) *v.*19, 'observe to do,' as in D.v.1,29, vi.3,25, vii.11, viii.1, xi.22,32, xii.1,32, xv.5, xvii.10,19, xix.9, xxiv.8, xxviii.1,15,58, xxxi.12, xxxii.46,—*nowhere else in the Pentateuch*;

*comp.* 'observe and do,' in the same context D.iv.6, vi.17(see *v.*18), vii.12, xiii.18, xvi.12, xxiii.23, xxiv.8, xxvi.16, xxviii.13, xxix.9: it occurs also in L.xviii.4,5,26,30, xix.37, xx.8,22, xxii.31, xxv.18, xxvi.3, but *nowhere else in the Pentateuch.*

N.B. There is evidently some peculiar relation between L.xviii–xxvi and the Book of Deuteronomy, of which there are many other indications.

(x) *v.*19, 'observe the *way* of Jehovah,' *comp.* D.v.33,viii.6,ix.12,16,x.12,xi.22,28, xiii.5, xix.9, xxvi.17, xxviii.9, xxx.16, xxxi.21,—also E.xxxii.8.

(xi) *v* 19, 'do righteousness and judgment';

*comp.* 'he did the righteousness of Jehovah and his judgment with Israel,' D.xxxiii.21.

N.B. 'righteousness and judgment' are found coupled in Jer.iv.2, ix.24,xxii,3,15, xxiii.5,xxxiii.15; *comp.*li.9, Ez.xviii.5,19,21,27, xxxiii.14,19,xlv.9, 1K.x.9,1Ch.xviii. 14, 2Ch.ix.8,—but *nowhere besides in the Bible*; so that the phrase is evidently a *later* prophetical formula.

(xii) *v.*19, צְדָקָה, 'righteousness,' G.xv.6(D), D.vi.25, ix.4,5,6, xxiv.13, xxxiii.21, —also G.xxx.33,—*nowhere besides in the Pentateuch.*

(xiii) *v.*19, '*bring upon* Abraham what He has spoken concerning him';

*comp.* '*bring upon* it all the curse written in this book,' D.xxix.27.

## 99. xix.1–38, *Jehovist*, except *v.*29.

(i) *v.*1, 'and the *two* angels came to Sodom,' referring evidently to the '*three* men' in xviii.2, of whom one, 'Jehovah,' remained behind with Abraham, xviii.22, while the two went on to Sodom.

(ii) *v.*1, 'at evening;' *comp.* xviii.1, where the 'three men' stood by Abraham in the 'heat of the day.'

(iii) *v.*1, 'and Lot saw and rose to meet them and bowed (with) his face to the earth';

*comp.* 'and he saw and ran to meet them, and bowed to the earth,' xviii.2.

*(iv) *v.*1, 'rise to meet' (97.vii).

*(v) *v.*1, 'bow with face to the earth,' xix.1, xlii.6$^{b}$, xlviii.12 (see 97.ix).

*(vi) *v.*2,8,19,20, הִנֶּה־נָא, 'behold I pray,' (59.xv).

*(vii) *v.*2,3, סוּר, 'turn-aside,' (43.v).

*(viii) *v.*2, לוּן, 'pass the night,' xix.2, xxiv.23,25,54, xxviii.11, xxxi.54, xxxii.13 (14),21(22).

*(ix) *v.*2, 'wash your feet,' (97.xv).

(x) *v.*2, 'and they said, No! for,' &c.; *comp.* 'and he said, No! for,' &c. xviii. 15, xlii.12.

*(xi) *v.*2, 'your servant,' *v.*19, 'thy servant,' (97.x).

*(xii) *v.*2, 'ye shall go on your ways,' *comp.* 'my way which I go,' xxiv.42, 'in all [the way] which thou art going,' xxviii.15, 'in this way which I am going,' xxviii.20, 'in the way which I went,' xxxv.3, 'in the way in which ye go,' xlii.38,—*comp.* also 'and Jacob went on his way,' xxxii.1, 'and Esau returned on his way,' xxxiii.16.

*(xiii) *v.*4, טֶרֶם, 'not yet,' (3.ii).

(xiv) *v.*4, 'men of Sodom,' as in xiii.13.

*(xv) *v.*4, 'from young-man and unto old man,' *v.*11, 'from small and unto great, (13.xi).

(xvi) *v.*5, 'and they called unto Lot and said to him, Where are the men, &c.'; *comp.* 'and he called unto the man and said to him, Where art thou?' iii.9.

*(xvii) *v.*5,8, 'know,' in a carnal sense, (5.i).

(xviii) *v.*6,11, 'opening' of the house, *comp.* 'opening' of the tent, xviii.1,2,10.

(xix) *v.*6,10, סָגַר, 'shut-to,' as in vii.16ᵇ.

*(xx) *v.*7,18, אַל־נָא, *al-na*, 'let not, I pray thee,' (63.xii).

*(xxi) *v.*7,9, הָרַע, 'do evil,' xix.7,9, xxxi.7, xlii.6, xliv.5, *comp.* (171.xxxiv).

(xxii) *v.*8,8,19, עָשָׂה לְ־, 'do to,' (47.ix).

(xxiii) *v.*8, 'good in your eyes,' (86.vii).

(xxiv) *v.*8,22, עַל־כֵּן, 'therefore,' (3.xvii).

(xxv) *v.*8, 'for therefore have they come under the shadow of my roof-tree', *comp.* 'for therefore have ye passed beside thy servant,' xviii.5.

*(xxvi) *v.*9,9, נָגַשׁ, 'come near,' (97.xxxii).

(xxvii) *v.*10, 'and they put-forth their hand, and brought Lot unto them into the house';

*comp.* 'and he put-forth his hand, . . . and brought it unto him into the Ark,' viii.9.

(xxviii) *v.*11, הִכָּה, 'smite,' (5.xxi).

(xxix) *v.*12, כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לְךָ, 'all which is thine,' (59.xxviii).

*(xxx) *v.*13, 'their cry,' refers to xviii.20,21, (97.xxvii).

*(xxxi) *v.*13,27, אֶת־פְּנֵי, 'before,' xix.13,27, xxvii.30, xxxiii.18.

*(xxxii) *v.*15,17, סָפָה, 'destroy,' as in xviii.23,24.

*(xxxiii) *v.*16, הֲנִיחַ, 'set-down,' (3.xi).

(xxxiv) *v.*16, 'and *left him* outside the city';

*comp.* 'and *left him* in the garden of Eden,' ii.15.

(xxxv) *v.*17, 'thy soul,' *v.*19,20, 'my soul,' (59.xxi).

(xxxvi) *v.*17,25, 'all the circuit,' as in xiii.10.

*(xxxvii) *v.*19, 'find favour in the eyes of,' (13.xii).

(xxxviii) *v.*19, 'do mercy with (עִם),' xix.19, xxiv.12,14, xl.14, xlvii.29,—also $E_2$ (110.xxiv); *comp.* (141.lv).

(xxxix) *v.*19, 'to keep-alive my soul,' *v.*20, 'my soul shall live'; *comp.* 'my soul shall live on account of thee,' xii.13.

*(xl) *v.*19, דָּבַק, 'cleave,' (3.xix).

(xli) *v.*19, וָאָמוּתָה, 'then I shall die,' *comp.* xxxiii.13, xliv.9,22,31.

*(xlii) *v.*21, 'lift-up the face,' as in xxxii.20, *comp.* (5.xix).

*(xliii) *v.*21, בִּלְתִּי, 'except,' (4.xii).

*(xliv) *v.*22, 'therefore (עַל־כֵּן) he called the name of the city Zoar,' (55.xii).

(xlv) *v.*22, the name 'Zoar' (צוֹעַר) formerly *Bela*, xiv.2, connected with מִצְעָר, 'little-one,' (3.iv).

(xlvi) *v.*24, 'caused-it-to-rain,' as in ii.5, vii.4.

*(xlvii) *v.*24,28, 'Sodom and Gomorrah,' (50.xi).

*(xlviii) *v.*25, 'dwellers in the cities,' *comp.* (63.xi).

(xlix) *v.*27, 'rise-early in the morning,' xix.27, xxii.3, xxvi.31, xxviii.18, xxxi.55, *comp.* xxiv.54,—also $E_2$ (110.xvi).

(l) *v.*27, 'unto the place where he stood before Jehovah,' refers to xviii.22.

*(li) *v.*28, שָׁקַף, 'look,' (97.xxiv).

(lii) *v.*28, 'he looked towards (עַל־פְּנֵי) Sodom,' as in xviii.16.

*(liii) *v.*31,33, בּוֹא, 'go in,' used of sexual intercourse (86.iii).

*(liv) *v.*31,33,34,35,37,38, בְּכִירָה, 'elder,' צְעִירָה, 'younger,' (47.viii).

*(lv) *v.*32, &c. שָׁכַב, 'lie' carnally, with עִם, xix.32,33,34,35, xxx.15,16, xxxix.7,12,14, with אֵת, xix.34, xxvi.10, xxxiv.2,7, xxxv.22[a].

(lvi) *v.*33, 'that night,' *v.*35, 'in that night,' xix.33,35, xxvi.24, xxx.16, xxxii.13,21,22; *comp.* 'in that day,' xxvi.32, xxx.35, xxxiii.16, xlviii.20,—also D(xv.18).

(lvii) *v.*37, the name 'Moab' (מוֹאָב) derived as if מֵאָב, 'out of a father,' or, perhaps, מֵי־אָב, 'waters (seed) of a father,' *comp.* Is.xlviii.1, 'who have come out of the *waters of Judah*' (3.iv).

*(lviii) *v.*37,38, 'unto this day,' xix.37,38, xxvi.33, xxxii.32, xxxv.20[b], xlvii.26, xlviii.15.

(lix) *v.*38, the name 'Ammon' (עַמּוֹן) derived from בֶּן־עַמִּי, 'son of my people,' (3.iv).

(lx) *v.*37, 'he was the father of Moab,' *v.*38, 'he was the father of Ammon'; *comp.* 'he was the father of, &c.,' iv.20,21.

100. BOEHMER, *p.*203–208, ascribes *v.*30–38 to the later Compiler of the time of Josiah. But his principal reasons for so doing seem to be: (i) that this section belongs, undoubtedly, to the same writer, who gives the account of Noah's drunkenness in ix.20, &c., a passage which he ascribes to the Compiler; and (ii) that the feeling manifested in this passage against Noah and Ammon suits best, as he thinks, a later period of the

Jewish history. We agree, however, with HUPFELD in assigning this section, as well as ix.18–27, to the Jehovist, who probably wrote the story of the birth of Moab and Ammon, in order to throw reproach upon these peoples in accounting for their names, while recognising a certain relationship between them and the tribes of Israel. We cannot suppose, with BOEHMER, *p.*204, that there was any well-known 'cave' actually in existence in the writer's time, to which tradition attached the story in question. The Hebrew article in the expression '*the* cave,' —if, indeed, the Masoretic punctuation be correct,—may be explained as in the other similar instances (41),='the cave *which was there*,' &c.

101. xix.29, *Elohist.*

This verse, manifestly, in its present position, forms a very strange and tame conclusion after the long and striking, circumstantial narrative of the Jehovist. Accordingly, we find in it plain traces of the Elohistic writer.

(i) 'the cities of the circuit,' 'the cities in which Lot dwelt,' (64.ii);
(ii) 'and Elohim remembered Abraham,' (37.i); *comp.* also G.ix.15,16, E.vi.5.

It seems probable that this verse was the text—the *thema*, as it were—upon which, as it lay before him in the original story, the Jehovist composed the narrative in xviii,xix, as a supplement to the very brief Elohistic notice.

102. xx.1–18.

This section, though containing 'Elohim' exclusively (*six* times), cannot be ascribed to the Elohistic author of i.1–31,&c., since it contains none of the peculiarities of his style, but on the contrary exhibits strong resemblances to that of the Jehovist. That the use of 'Elohim' here is designed and intentional,—not accidental,—is allowed by DELITZSCH, who writes as follows, *Gen.p.*405 :—

The justification of the critical analysis displays itself here also in the fact that Abraham, in speaking with Abimelech, always names God 'Elohim.' Upon this

KEIL observes, 'Of Jehovah, Abraham's Covenant-God, the Philistine king knows nothing and needs know nothing.' But why not? Nay, this very same Abimelech names God 'Jehovah' in xxvi.28,29. And does not Abram in xiv.22, when talking with the king of Sodom, name God 'Jehovah'? Why not here also, since Abimelech shows such childlike piety, such ready recognition of God's prophet, and so deep a sense of right and wrong,—in particular, of the sanctity of marriage? . . . Since, then, there is no reason of necessity, why Abraham in the presence of Abimelech should name God 'Elohim' instead of 'Jehovah,' the use of this Divine Name in this narrative can be explained only as a consequence of the source from which it has been derived.

103. The resemblance, however, between the style of these (later) Elohistic passages and that of the Jehovist is so very great that it becomes at times a matter of some difficulty to discriminate them. Accordingly, the views of HUPFELD and BOEHMER, who both maintain the theory of *three* original independent documents, (those of the Elohist, Second Elohist, and Jehovist,) which have been combined into one narrative by a later Compiler, vary considerably as to the parts assigned by them to $E_2$ and J, respectively; and, indeed, in the history of Joseph, xxxvii, xxxix—l, the former does not profess to have effected the complete separation.

104. The difficulty is increased by the fact that the Jehovist not unfrequently uses 'Elohim' as a personal name,—(besides using it habitually as an appellative, and repeatedly in the compound form 'Jehovah-Elohim' in the section ii.4$^b$-iii.24)—as in iii.1,3,5, ix.27, iv.25, xvi.13, xxi.6,33, xxxiii.5,10,11,20, (not to mention xxviii.20,xxxii.28,30, where special reasons may be given for his using it), all which passages are assigned by HUPFELD himself to the Jehovist, as is also xxvii.28, where the same writer uses הָאֱלֹהִים. Again HUPFELD speaks doubtfully of xxii.1–14, where we have again 'Elohim' in *v.*8,12, and הָאֱלֹהִים in *v.*1,3,9, as he does also about l.23–26, where we have 'Elohim' in *v.*24,25, both which passages we give to the Jehovist. And there are many other passages, summed up in (193), in which 'Elohim' is freely, if not exclusively, used, and which, from the internal evidence of our analysis, we ascribe

to the Jehovist (often in common with BOEHMER), whereas HUPFELD (sometimes merely because of the 'Elohim') gives them to the Second Elohist. In fact, in xxxiii—a Jehovistic chapter, as HUPFELD allows—'Elohim' *is* used exclusively, *four* times.

105. These phenomena give rise to the suspicion whether the Second Elohist and Jehovist are really different persons—whether they may not be the *same* person, in different stages of his life. That the sets of passages, which we denote by $E_2$ and J, are totally distinct in style and character from the original Elohistic matter is certain, and is recognised by all competent critics.

Thus HUPFELD says, *p.*167—

That it ($E_2$) in its point of view and modes of conception and expression differs considerably from the prime-document (E) and comes closer to the Jehovistic, and in general bears a later stamp akin to that of the latter, we have already remarked and demonstrated.

It is admitted also that $E_2$ and J wrote nearly in the same age,—at least, that $E_2$ wrote much nearer to the time of J than to that of E,—and that $E_2$ wrote *previously* to J.

Thus again HUPFELD writes, *p.* 193:—

In it ($E_2$) the old Elohistic legends of the Patriarchal time are reproduced throughout in a further development of their principal features from similar points of view and in the like direction as in the Jehovistic matter, but not yet upon the same stage of development, . . . and they assume a middle place between E and J, but much nearer to the latter than the former. They must, consequently, be in time also older than the Jehovistic matter.

In the following analysis, however, we have noted the points of agreement between $E_2$ and those passages which, from internal evidence, we must assign to J; and they will be found to be so very numerous that the question, as we have said, is raised, whether we have not in all these sections a series of supplementary additions from the hand of one and the same writer, made at different parts of his life.

106. It might be supposed, for instance, that this writer, in the earliest of his insertions, may have used 'Elohim' *exclusively*,

either following the example of E, or having the same reason which we may suppose E to have had, for abstaining from the use of 'Jehovah' in the patriarchal age, whatever that reason may have been. Then, in his later insertions, he may have used 'Jehovah' occasionally, but not so freely as 'Elohim.' And, at last, he may have interpolated other episodes, written now with a somewhat freer hand and more practised pen, while still presenting the identical features of his own peculiar style, and dealing with the same kind of subjects as before,—and in these he may have employed almost exclusively the name 'Jehovah.' But we must reserve this point for further consideration when we have completed the analysis of Genesis, and have all the facts of the case before us. In the course of our analysis we may properly speak of $E_2$ as distinct from J, since in any case these (later) passages containing only Elohim were written *previously* to those which are more decidedly Jehovistic as regards the use of the Divine name.

107. On xx.1 BOEHMER writes, *p.*111 :—

> HUPFELD, *p.*209, ascribes this verse to the Jehovist, referring to *p.*173–175, where he has shown this. There, however, he himself says that this verse with its data of place 'cannot with perfect certainty be denied to $E_2$, since it supplies the indispensable notice of the locality for the narrative which follows.' It seems to me that the difficulty is solved simply by separating for C($E_2$) only the last two words of *v.*1, which are not at all required for the preceding datum belonging to B(J), but on the contrary suit well for C($E_2$) as the beginning of what follows.

BOEHMER, then, would make xx.1$^b$ follow xvi.15$^a$ thus—

> 'And Hagar bare to Abram a son, and he sojourned in Gerar.'

But the construction here is so very harsh, that it would be difficult to assent to this view, even if we had not shown sufficiently that xvi.15$^a$ cannot possibly belong to $E_2$.

108. But the 'difficulty' which HUPFELD notices, arises only from the fact that in *v.*1 we have the expression 'and Abraham journeyed *from thence*'; and this, of course, *is* perplexing in the very commencement of an *independent* narrative. For us no such difficulty exists; since if $E_2$ had before him, as we

suppose, the original Elohistic document, he might here be merely referring to the last preceding notice of the Elohist about Abram's 'dwelling in the land of Canaan,' xiii.12$^{a}$, with reference to which he may now, of course, have written, with the necessary change of the patriarch's name into Abraham,—

'And Abraham journeyed *from thence* towards the *Negeb*, and dwelt between Kadesh and Shur, and sojourned in Gerar.'

Or he may have written 'from thence' *loosely*, without any special reference to any other place at all, merely to introduce his own interpolation.

At all events, there seems no reason to doubt that the whole section xx.1–17 belongs to $E_2$. And, if he really did write (as HUPFELD and BOEHMER both suppose) a complete independent narrative, it would have to be supposed that the Compiler has left out all that preceded xx.1. But this appears to us a rather improbable supposition.

109. In *v.*1 we have 'Negeb,' 'Kadesh,' 'Shur,' and these names occur also in previous Jehovistic passages, *viz.* 'Negeb,' xii.9, xiii.1,3, 'Kadesh,' xvi.14, 'Shur,' xvi.7 : but HUPFELD and BOEHMER both agree with us in believing that the Second Elohist wrote *before* the Jehovist. Hence the *first* mention of these places in Genesis must have been made by the *former*, and, as we suppose, in the passage before us. According to our view also, *viz.* that the Jehovist wrote to supplement the story as it came into his hands, *already enlarged by the insertions of* $E_2$, the Jehovist will have had before him the statements in xx.1,&c. when he wrote his own additions, and may have followed anywhere the lead, or assumed as known the data, of *either* of the two older writers, E and $E_2$. In other words, the Jehovist may, perhaps, be found to refer to either of the two Elohists, and the Second Elohist may be found to refer to the first,—but not *vice versâ* in either case.

110. xx.1–17, *Second Elohist.*

The following analysis shows, as we have said (103), that

there is a very great similarity in style and expression between $E_2$ and J. It shows also that $E_2$ refers to E, and that J refers to $E_2$ and E, (109),—but not *vice versâ*.

(i) *v.*1, 'from thence,' either referring to xiii.12[a](E), 'Abram dwelt in the land of Canaan,' or perhaps said loosely, without reference to any particular place, and merely introducing this interpolated incident.

(ii) *v.*1, 'land of the Negeb,' as in J(xxiv.62),—only thrice besides in the Bible, N.xiii.29, Jo.xv.19, Ju.i.15.

(iii) *v.*1, 'and dwelt between Kadesh and Shur,' *i.e.* probably, not far from the well Lakhai-roi, as appears from the description of it in xvi.7, 'the spring in the way to Shur,' *v.*14, 'between Kadesh and Bered'; but neither this well, nor the adjoining well at Beersheba (121), is *named* by $E_2$.

(iv) *v.*2, 'send and take'; *comp.* J(180.xlvii).

(v) *v.*3, 'and Elohim came unto Abimelech in a dream of the night and said to him';

*comp.* 'and Elohim came unto Laban in a dream of the night and said to him,' xxxi.24(J).

(vi) *v.*3, 'behold, thou diest!' *comp.* J(xxx.1[d], xlviii.21, l.5).

(vii) *v.*5,6, לֵבָב, 'heart,' as in J(xxxi.26)—*nowhere else in Genesis.*

(viii) *v.*6, 'and Elohim said unto him in a dream'; *comp.* J(xxxi.11).

(ix) *v.*6,17, הָאֱלֹהִים, 'ELOHIM,' xx.6,17, xli.25,28,32,32; *comp.* J(133.ii).

(x) *v.*6, 'I (pron.) know that, &c.,' xx.6; *comp.* J(216.viii).

(xi) *v.*6, וָאֶחְשָׂךְ, 'withhold,' xx.6; *comp.* J(xxii.12), imitated by D(xxii.16).

(xii) *v.*6, עַל־כֵּן, 'therefore'; *comp.* J(3.xvii).

(xiii) *v.*6, נָגַע, 'touch'; *comp.* J(4.vi).

(xiv) *v.*6, 'I suffered thee not to touch her';

*comp.* 'Elohim suffered him not to do evil to me,' xxxi.7(J).

(xv) *v.*7, כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לָךְ, 'all which is thine,' *comp.* J(59.xxviii).

(xvi) *v.*8, 'rise-early in the morning,' xx.8, xxi.14; *comp.* J(99.xlix).

(xvii) *v.*9, עָשָׂה לְ, 'do to'; *comp.* J(47.ix).

(xviii) *v.*9, 'what hast thou done to us?' *v.*10, 'what sawest thou that thou hast done this thing?' *comp.* J(4.xiii).

(xix) *v.*9, 'and Abimelech called to Abraham and said'; *comp.* J(xii.18,xxvi.9).

(xx) *v.*9, 'thou hast brought upon me . . . a great sin';

*comp.* 'thou hast brought upon us transgression,' xxvi.10(J).

(xxi) *v.*11, 'fear of Elohim'; *comp.* J(xxii.12, xlii.18).

(xxii) *v.*13, Elohim used with a plural verb; *comp.* J(xxxi.53, xxxv.7).

(xxiii) תָּעָה, 'wander,' xx.13, xxi.14; *comp.* J(xxxvii.15).

(xxiv) *v.*13, 'do mercy with (עִם),' xx.13, xxi.23; *comp.* J(99.xxxviii).

(xxv) *v.*14, 'flocks and herds and servants and maids'; *comp.* J(59.xxii).

(xxvi) *v.*15, 'be good (evil) in the eyes of,' xx.15, xxi.11,12; *comp.* J(86.vii).

(xxvii) *v.*15, 'my land is before thee'; *comp.* J(63.xiii).

(xxviii) *v.*16, הוֹכֵחַ, 'correct, set-right,' xx.16, xxi.25; *comp.* J(141.xxvi).

(xxix) *v.*17, אָמָה, 'maiden,' xx.17, xxi.10,10,12,13; *comp.* J(xxx.3, xxxi.33).
(xxx) *v.*17, 'and they (*masc.*) bare'; *comp.* J(xxxi.43).

111. xx.18, *Jehovist.*

BOEHMER, *p.*98, assigns this verse also to $E_2$, because he supposes that both E and $E_2$ may have used the name 'Jehovah' occasionally. But certainly it would be strange that in this very chapter $E_2$ should use 'Elohim' *six* times, and in the next chapter *nine* times,—that is, should use it exclusively *fifteen* times,—but should employ 'Jehovah' in this particular verse, which has all the appearance of being a mere gloss upon *v.*17$^b$. Accordingly, with HUPFELD, KNOBEL, KUENEN, DELITZSCH, we regard this verse as an interpolation by some Jehovistic writer; and the following phenomena seem to point to the Jehovist.

(i) בְּעַד 'behind,' (31.iii)—also $E_2$(xx.7).
(ii) עַל-דְּבַר 'because of,' (59.xxv)—also $E_2$(xx.11).
(iii) 'Jehovah had *restrained* (עָצַר) every womb';
*comp.* 'Jehovah hath *restrained* me from bearing,' xvi.2.
N.B. This last idiom only occurs again in Is.lxvi.9.

It is obvious that if this verse is really due to the Jehovist, it throws a strong light upon the nature of his work, and shows that he wrote *after* the Second Elohist, and was really, as we suppose, a mere supplementer of the narrative which lay before him. And, if this be true of the Jehovist, who here supplements a defective notice of the Second Elohist, it is true *à fortiori* of the latter, whose additions begin abruptly with xx.1.

112. If, however, the Jehovist inserted, as it would seem, this supplementary note in *v.*18, we may suppose that he made this addition to the narrative of $E_2$, in xx.1–17, at some time *before* writing his own parallel narrative, xii.14–20. Otherwise, as he must have been aware that the two stories in xii.14–20, xx.1–17, repeated each other, we can hardly imagine that he would have taken the trouble to introduce the two connecting links, xx.18, xxi.1. If he had already written xii.14–20, he would rather, we should suppose, have *cancelled*

xx.1-17, and suppressed it altogether, instead of *welding* it, as it were, more completely into the narrative. See on this point also (172–175).

113. xxi.1.

Both HUPFELD and BOEHMER give this to the Jehovist; and the latter makes the following effort to retain the idea of the *independence* and *completeness* of all the three documents. To E he assigns *v.*2$^{ac}$,4,5,—to $E_2$, *v.*3,6,8,—to J, *v.*2$^{b}$,7; and he further supposes, *p.*208, that the words 'and bare Abraham a son' must have occurred in the original documents *twice, viz.* in E and J, and been omitted once by the Compiler. But this seems too artificial to be real, more especially as there is not the slightest difficulty here in separating the documents, *except* for those who maintain the above view. ILGEN, however, HUPFELD, KNOBEL, DELITZSCH, KUENEN,—indeed, it may be said, almost all critical commentators,—give *v.*2–5 unhesitatingly to the Elohist, as we do. And in fact it seems to us certain that *v.*3—which BOEHMER, *p.*112, assigns to $E_2$, because 'something of this kind *must* precede *v.*6'—belongs to E (115.vi). Consequently, BOEHMER'S own sense of the difficulty, which here presses on his theory of three complete independent narratives, must be regarded as a strong argument against it.

114. xxi.1, *Jehovist.*

The words of this verse—

'and Jehovah visited Sarah as He had said, and Jehovah did to Sarah as He had spoken,'—

have the appearance of being a mere link, serving, says DELITZSCH, *p.*644,

to connect the foregoing history with the following, and to take up the Jehovistic passage, xviii.10,14, into the train of the narrative.

Hence J must have written it *after* having written xviii,xix.

(i) 'as He had said,' 'as He had spoken,' refers to xviii.10,14.
(ii) עָשָׂה לְ, 'do to,' (47.ix).
(iii) 'He did to Sarah as He had spoken,' (97.xvii).

115. xxi.2–5, *Elohist.*

(i) *v.*2, וַתַּהַר וַתֵּלֶד שָׂרָה, 'and Sarah conceived and bare'; *comp.* a similar order of the Hebrew verbs in xxv.8, וַיִּגְוַע וַיָּמָת אַבְרָהָם.

(ii) *v.*2, 'and Sarah bare to Abraham a son';

*comp.* 'and Hagar bare to Abraham a son,' xvi.15,(58.v.N.B.).

(iii) *v.*2 'to his old age,' refers to xvii.17.

*(iv) *v.*2, 'at the *season* which Elohim spake with him';

*comp.* 'whom Sarah shall bear to thee at this *season* in the next year,' xvii.21.

(v) *v.*2, 'speak with' (אֶת), (95.xi).

*(vi) *v.*3, 'and Abraham called the name of his son that was born to him, whom Sarah bare to him, Isaac';

*comp.* 'indeed Sarah thy wife shall bear to thee a son, and thou shalt call his name Isaac,' xvii.19.

*(vii) *v.*4, 'and Abraham circumcised Isaac his son, a son of eight days, according to what Elohim commanded him';

*comp.* 'and a son of eight days shall be circumcised among you,' xvii.12.

*(viii) *v.*5, 'and Abraham was a son of 100 years, &c.,' refers to xvii.1,17.

(ix) *v.*5, 'date of Isaac's birth,' (10.vii).

*(x) *v.*5, מְאַת, 'hundred,' (10.ix).

116. xxi.6,7, *Jehovist.*

HUPFELD, *p.*144, gives both these verses, as we do, to J: BOEHMER gives *v.*6 to $E_2$ and *v.*7 to J.

(i) *v.*6, עָשָׂה לִי, 'do to,' (47.ix).

(ii) *v.*6, 'laughter (צְחֹק) has Elohim made to me; every one that heareth will laugh (יִצְחַק) with me,' indirect derivation of the name Isaac (יִצְחָק) as in (3.iv).

(iii) *v.*6, 'laughter has Elohim made to me'; *comp.* the similar use of Elohim by J, in the derivation of a name, in iv.25.

(iv) *v.*7, 'a son to his old-age';

*comp.* 'son of his old-age,' xxxvii.3, 'child of his old-age,' xliv.20;

also with זְקֻנִים, 'old-age,' *comp.* נְעוּרִים, 'youth,' viii.21, xlvi.34.

N.B. J in *v.*7 seems to have taken up the words of E in *v.*2, and, in speaking of Sarah 'suckling,' to be referring to the story of $E_2$ about the 'feast of *weaning*,' *v.*8.

117. xxi.8–20, *Second Elohist.*

(i) *v.*8, 'and the child grew,' *v.*20, 'and he (the lad) grew';

*comp.* 'and the lads grew,' J(xxv.27).

(ii) *v.*8, 'and Abraham made a great feast on the day of Isaac's being weaned';

*comp.* 'on the third day, the day of Pharaoh's being born, he made a feast to all his servants,' xl.20; *comp.* also J(xix.3, xxvi.30, xxix.22).

(iii) *v.*9, 'the son of Hagar the Egyptian, whom she bare to Abraham, refers to xvi.3,15(E): but E uses *always* שִׁפְחָה, for 'maid,' xvi.1,3, xxv.12, xxix.24,29, xxx.4ᵃ,7,9,10,12,18, xxxv.25,26, *never* אָמָה, which occurs throughout this section.

(iv) *v.*10,10,12,13, אָמָה, 'maiden,' as in xx.17,—*comp.* J(xxx.3, xxxi.33).

(v) *v.*11,12, 'be evil in the eyes of'; *comp.* xx.15, and J(86.vii).

(vi) *v.*11, עַל אוֹדוֹת, 'on account of,' as in xxi.25; *comp.* J(xxvi.32).

(vii) *v.*12, 'hearken to the voice of'; *comp.* J(180.ix).

(viii) *v.*13, 'I will *place* him for a nation,' *v.*18, 'for a great nation will I *place* him'; *comp.* 'for a great nation will I *place* thee there,' xlvi.3(J):

E has 'I will *give* him for a nation,' xvii.20; *comp.* also xvii.5,6, xlviii.4.

(ix) *v.*14, 'rise-early in the morning,' as in xx.8; *comp.* J(99.xlix).

(x) *v.*14, Abraham's 'rising-early in the morning,' is after a vision or dream, *v.*12,13; *comp.* xx.8 after *v.*3–7, and J(xxii.3, after *v.*1,2).

(xi) *v.*14, תָּעָה, 'wander,' as in xx.13; *comp.* J(xxxvii.15).

(xii) *v.*16, 'lift-up the voice and weep'; *comp.* J(180.xl).

(xiii) *v.*17, 'fear not'; *comp.* J(171.xiv),D(xv.1).

(xiv) *v.*16, בָּכָה, 'weep'; *comp.* J(180.xli).

(xv) *v.*17, '*Elohim heard* the voice of the lad,' 'for *Elohim hath heard* the voice of the lad,' alludes plainly to the name 'Ishmael' = El hears;

*comp.* 'thou shalt call his name Ishmael, for Jehovah *hath heard* thy affliction,' xvi.11(J), and the Jehovistic allusions (3.iv).

(xvi) *v.*20, 'Elohim was with (אֵת) the lad';

*comp.* 'Elohim is with (עִם) thee,' xxi.22, and J(163.x).

118. BOEHMER ascribes *v.*9,18, to the Compiler, and says, *p.*208:—

(i) $E_2$ makes Sarah desire the expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael as soon as Isaac was born, 'for the son of the bondwoman shall not inherit with my son, with Isaac,' *v.*10; but here in *v.*9 the reason assigned for his expulsion is because Ishmael 'mocked' Isaac.

(ii) $E_2$ regards Ishmael as quite a little child, who could be carried by his mother, *v.*14, (where, however, as BOEHMER observes, the syntax allows of our referring 'the child' to 'he gave,' and not to 'putting on her shoulder,') whom she 'casts' under a shrub, when the water fails in the wilderness, *v.*15, and who 'grows up' afterwards, *v.*20; but here in *v.*9 he is already too big for this; and so in *v.*18 the expressions used, 'lift the youth, and grasp him by the hand,' imply a boy of larger growth.

(iii) The Compiler, therefore, in *v.*9, wishing to relieve Abraham from the charge of hardheartedness, in sending the innocent Hagar with the tender child into the wilderness, makes Ishmael a full-grown lad, and gives him also the blame of mocking Sarah, for which last he had a precedent in the conduct of Hagar, as described by the Jehovist in xvi.4, and he therefore only makes Ishmael follow his mother's bad example.

*Ans.* (i) *v.*10 cannot have followed *v.*8 without *v.*9 intervening, as the subject is wanting to the verb 'and she said.' In fact, *v.*10 contains the reason, which Sarah assigns to Abraham for Ishmael's expulsion; but *v.*9 gives the immediate cause of her angry and jealous feelings being aroused.

(ii) The expressions in *v.*14,15,20, are not inconsistent with the idea of Ishmael's being a great boy of fourteen, even supposing that his mother carried him on her back; since Umkungo, son of Umpande, King of the Zulus, was just such a lad as this, and very fat, when he fled from his brother's fury not long ago; and he was then carried by his mother, and might have been 'cast under a tree' by her, if dying from thirst, or 'lifted-up and grasped by the hand;' and he 'grew-up' afterwards in Natal.

(iii) It is rather J, as we suppose, who, in the account of Hagar's misbehaviour in xvi.4, follows the lead of the older passage, xxi.9.

119. Again, in *v.*17, the words 'and an angel of Elohim called unto Hagar out of heaven,' are also, according to BOEHMER, *p.*211, an interpolation of the Compiler, who did not like that God should speak directly to Hagar, a mere woman, and not even one of the holy line, whereas in xxii.11 it is only the voice of an angel which speaks even to Abraham. The Compiler, in fact, says BOEHMER, must have adopted the words before us in *v.*17 from xxii.11,15, where only the phrase occurs 'an angel called out of heaven'; only he has changed 'angel of *Jehovah*' into 'angel of *Elohim*,' in order to suit the context, in which 'Elohim' is found exclusively.

*Ans.* Rather, (133.xvii), the writer of xxii.11 follows xxi.17.

120. xxi.21, *Jehovist.*

HUPFELD, p.30,82, assigns *v.*21 to the Elohist, and supposes that it may have been inserted originally before xxv.11; but afterwards, p.176, he gives *v.*8–21 wholly to $E_2$.

BOEHMER agrees with HUPFELD that *v.*20$^b$,—

'and he dwelt in the wilderness, and became great in the bow,'—

could hardly have been followed originally by *v.*21,—

'and he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran, and his mother took for him a wife out of the land of Egypt';—

and he decides to assign *v.*21 certainly to $E_2$, (he does not say why,) and *v.*20$^b$ to the Jehovist.

But *v.*21 appears very much like a gloss by the Jehovist on *v.*20,—an expansion of the older notice. In *v.*20 we have 'the wilderness,' referring apparently to 'the wilderness of *Beer-*

*sheba,*' mentioned before in *v.*14. Would the *same* writer, *writing at the same time,* have called it 'the wilderness of *Paran,*' *v.*21? Observe also that the notice 'great in the *bow*' has a sort of echo in *v.*16, 'as the shooting of a *bow*'; while that in *v.*21, 'his mother took a wife for him out of the land of Egypt,' corresponds to 'thou shalt take a wife for my son out of my kindred,' xxiv.40; *comp.* xxi.21, xxiv.3,4,7,37,38,40,48, xxxiv.4, xxxviii.6.

121. The 'well of water,' which was shown to Hagar, *v.*19, is, probably, the same as the famous well near Beersheba (124), 'Lakhai-roi,' at which Hagar was found *many years previously,* by 'the angel of Jehovah,' as the Jehovist tells us,—

'in the wilderness, by the fountain in the way to Shur,' xvi.7,—

which received its name in consequence of the Divine consolations which were then imparted to her, *v.*8–14. And this would agree with the fact that, according to $E_2$, Abraham was at this time 'dwelling between Kadesh and Shur,' xx.1; and the well 'Lakhai-roi' is also described as lying 'between Kadesh and Bered,' xvi.14, 'in the way to Shur,' *v.*7.

At any rate, if the well now spoken of was not the same well as 'Lakhai-roi,' it must have been very near it; and it would be, on the traditionary view, difficult to explain how Hagar could here be described as perishing, with her child, from want of water, when she knew that there was a well in the neighbourhood, to which she had fled of her own accord in former years, and where she had been so graciously visited.

122. Here, however, not the least allusion is made to the former narrative in xvi.7–14; and the fact is plain that the two stories, as they stand, are at variance with each other.

That now before us was evidently written *first,* and described the discovery of this, no doubt, far-famed well to Hagar, xxi.19, but without mentioning its name. The Jehovist, writing *afterwards,* and wishing, perhaps, to derive the name which was probably in his time attached to the well, may have inserted

the story in xvi.4–14, either without perceiving that he was introducing thereby a contradiction, or, possibly, (174), with the intention of *cancelling* this earlier notice of $E_2$ altogether. It is plain, however, as we have said, that the account of $E_2$ was *first* written, since, if this writer had had before him the narrative in xvi.4–14, he would hardly have said in xxi.19, 'she saw a well of water,' without identifying the well in some way with that which was already so conspicuous in the story.

123. xxi.22-32, *Second Elohist*, except *v.*27$^b$–31.

(i) *v.*22, 'and it came to pass at that time,' as in J(xxxviii.1)—*nowhere else in the Pentateuch.*

(ii) *v.*22, 'Elohim is with (עִם) thee,' (117.xvi), *comp.* J(163.x).

(iii) *v.*23, 'swear to me by Elohim,' *v.*24, 'and Abraham said I will swear'; *comp.* 'I will make thee swear by Jehovah,' J(xxiv.3), and J(126.x).

(iv) *v.*23, 'do mercy with (עִם),' (110.xxiv), *comp.* J(99.xxxviii).

(v) *v.*25, הוֹכִיחַ, 'correct, set right,' as in xx.16, *comp.* J(141.xxvi).

(vi) *v.*25, עַל אוֹדֹת, 'on account of,' as in xxi.11, *comp.* J(xxvi.32).

(vii) *v.*25, גָּזַל, 'take by force,' *comp.* J(xxxi.31).

(viii) *v.*25, 'servants of Abimelech'; *comp.* xx.8, 'Abimelech called to all his servants'; *comp.* also 'servants of Isaac,' J(xxvi.25,32), &c.

(ix) *v.*26, 'do this thing,' as in xx.10, *comp.* J(216.xiii).

(x) *v.*26, 'thou also,' 'I also,' *comp.* 'she also,' xx.5, 'I also,' xx.6, also J(iv.4, 22,26, x.21, &c.).

(xi) *v.*26, בִּלְתִּי, 'except,' *comp.* J(4.xii).

(xii) *v.*27, 'flocks and herds,' xx.14, *comp.* J(59.xxii).

(xiii) *v.*27$^a$, 'and Abraham took flocks and herds, and gave to Abimelech'; *comp.* 'and Abimelech took flocks and herds, and gave to Abraham,' xx.14.

(xiv) *v.*32, 'cut a covenant,' *comp.* J(126.ii), D(xv.18).

(xv) *v.*32, קוּם, 'arise' = start, *comp.* J(63.xxv).

(xvi) *v.*32, 'Beersheba,' already named in *v.*14.

124. $E_2$ has evidently in *v.*23,24, used the word שָׁבַע, 'swear,' with allusion to the name of בְּאֵר־שָׁבַע, *beer-sheba*h, 'Beersheba' = 'well of the oath,' though he does not formally derive it; *comp.* the allusion to the name 'Ishmael' in *v.*17. The well here spoken of is, probably, the other of the two famous wells at Beersheba, about 100 yards apart, one of which seems to have been called 'Beersheba' = 'well of the oath,' xxi.31,xxvi.33, and the other 'Lakhai-roi' (121).

This well lay, apparently, within the Philistine territory, —otherwise Abimelech's servants would not have interfered with Abraham, xxi.25, nor Abraham have paid a price for it, xxi.30,—but still 'in the wilderness,' xvi.7,xxi.14, *i.e.* on the outskirts of the district of Gerar; so that the king might be said to have 'returned unto the land of the Philistines,' when he went back from the desert to the inhabited country of Gerar.

125. xxi.27$^{b}$–31.

In *v.*27$^{b}$, 'and they cut a covenant both of them,' the Jehovist seem to have taken up the words of $E_2$ in *v.*32, 'and they cut a covenant in Beersheba,' not being quite satisfied with the account of the affair as it stands in $E_2$, according to which it was only *Abraham* who had to 'swear,' *v.*23,24, that he would do no wrong to Abimelech, or to the land which had so hospitably entertained him, and according to which also Abraham had no claim to the well, which he had dug in Philistine territory, except through his having found it, and having been allowed by the king to keep it. By this insertion, therefore, J makes them *both* swear to one another, *v.*31, and preludes this by saying that they '*both* made a covenant,' *v.*27$^{b}$; whereas $E_2$ in *v.*32 simply says what was quite sufficient, 'they made a covenant at Beersheba.' So, too, the Jehovist makes Abraham pay a price for the well, *v.*28–30. And lastly, in his usual style, he formally derives the name 'Beersheba,' *v.*31.

126. xxi.27$^{b}$–31, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*27$^{b}$, 'and they both of them cut a covenant,' an expansion of *v.*32$^{a}$ ($E_2$), 'and they cut a covenant'; but the repetition implies that there is here some kind of interpolation, and the awkwardness of the expression, '*both of them*,' applied to making a covenant, suggests that *this* is the interpolated formula, in imitation of *v.*32$^{a}$, and in preparation for *v.*31$^{b}$, 'there they sware *both of them*.'

(ii) *v.*27$^{b}$, 'cut a covenant,' xxi.27$^{b}$,xxvi.28, xxxi.44, also $E_2$(xxi.32), D(xv.18).

(iii) *v.*28,29, הִצִּיב, 'set-up,' xxi.28, xxviii.12, xxxv.20$^{a}$, *comp.* (97.v),—also E(xxxv.14).

(iv) *v.*28,29,30, שֶׁבַע, 'seven,' is used here *repeatedly* with special reference to the name 'Beer-sheba.'

*(v) *v.*28,29, לְבַד, 'apart,' (3.xiii).

(vi) *v.*29, 'what are these seven lambs which thou hast set by themselves?'

*comp.* 'what is all this camp of thine which I met?' xxxiii.8; also xxxiii.5.

*(vii) *v.*30, 'take out of the hand of,' (5.xv).

*(viii) *v.*30, בַּעֲבוּר, 'for the sake of,' (4.xviii).

*(ix) *v.*31, 'therefore (עַל-כֵּן) he called that place Beersheba,' derivation as in (55.xii).

(x) *v.*31, שָׁבַע, 'swear,' xxi.31, xxiv.3,7,9,37, xxv.33,33, xxvi.3,31, xxxi.53, xlvii.31,31, l.5,6,24,25;

*comp.* שְׁבוּעָה, 'oath,' xxiv.8, xxvi.3, אָלָה, 'oath,' xxiv.41,41, xxvi.28,—and see also $E_2$(xxi.23,24).

127. HUPFELD, p.201, &c. seems to assign *v.*22-32 wholly to $E_2$.

BOEHMER gives *v.*22-27,31 to $E_2$, *v.*28-30,32, to the Compiler.

The latter observes, *p.*211, that there is here a double derivation of the name 'Beersheba': $E_2$ explains it as meaning 'well of *the oath*,' because 'there they sware both of them,' *v.*31; whereas the *Compiler* explains it to mean 'well of seven,' from the 'seven lambs' paid by Abraham to secure the well, *v.*30.

*Ans.* No doubt, there is a double attempt at derivation, though one of them, *viz.* that referring to the purchase of the well for 'seven' lambs, is implied rather than expressed. The derivation from the act of 'swearing' is the only one distinctly specified by the Jehovist in *v.*31, in accordance with the suggestion of $E_2$ in *v.*23, 24. And the phenomena noted above in (126.i) seem to imply that the passage has been interpolated. But the indications point, as it seems to us, to the Jehovist as the interpolator, and not to the later Compiler.

128. xxi.33,34, *Jehovist.*

*(i) *v.*33, 'call on the name of Jehovah,' (5.xxx).

(ii) *v.*33, 'the everlasting El,' *comp.* 'the everlasting mountains,' xlix.26.

(iii) *v.*34, 'and Abraham sojourned in the land of the Philistines,' *i.e.* as we suppose, at Beersheba, where according to this author, xxii.19, Abraham was living long after the events recorded in this chapter. For Beersheba (124) was regarded apparently as within the Philistine territory, though not lying in the *inhabited* part of it about Gerar, which is called (by $E_2$) in a *stricter* sense 'the land of the Philistines,' *v.*32. The Jehovist, by using here the same expression in a more general sense, has somewhat confused the narrative.

*(iv) *v.*34, 'many days,' as in xxxvii.34;

*comp.* 'the days were prolonged to him,' xxvi.8, 'the days became many,' xxxviii.12.

129. BOEHMER remarks, *p.*211, that, since in *v.*32 Abimelech returned from Beersheba unto the 'land of the Philistines,' it

would seem that in the writer's time Beersheba was *not* regarded as Philistine territory. The *same* writer, he says, in *v.*34 makes Abraham, after planting the grove of tamarisks at Beersheba, follow Abimelech into 'the land of the Philistines,' and sojourn long there. Accordingly, he assigns *v.*33 to $E_2$ (though it contains Jehovah), and *v.*34 to the Compiler.

HUPFELD also, *p.*148,149, while giving, as we do, *v.*33,34, to the Jehovist, takes the same view of the 'land of the Philistines' as entirely distinguished from Beersheba in *v.*32, though *not* in the J. passage, *v.*34. Observing also that the subject of the verb 'planted' is wanting in *v.*33, he supposes that the Compiler may have *inverted* the order of the two verses, *v.*33,34, inserting them here from the complete independent J. story, because they concern the same place, Beersheba, which was the scene of the foregoing story in xxi.9–32, but changing their order, so as to avoid the glaring contradiction that would have existed between *v.*32$^b$ and *v.*34, if they had been made to follow each other immediately thus,—

'and they returned unto the land of the Philistines ($E_2$). And Abraham sojourned in the land of the Philistines many days (J).'

130. It will be seen that our own view approximates most to that of HUPFELD. With him we believe that the 'land of the Philistines' *is* distinguished from Beersheba in *v.*32($E_2$), but only as 'the City' might be distinguished from the *outskirts* of London—whereas in *v.*34(J) it is not so distinguished, but the 'land of the Philistines' there includes Beersheba.

In this manner the Jehovist lays the foundation of the sanctity of various places, 'Shechem,' xii.6,7, 'Bethel,' xii.8,xiii. 3,4, 'Hebron,' xiii.18, and now 'Beersheba,' xxi.33, at all which places, he says, Abraham 'called upon the name of Jehovah.'

The absence of any subject to the verb in *v.*33 may be due merely to the inadvertence of the writer. At all events, we cannot refer for the subject either to *v.*32($E_2$) or *v.*31(J).

131. xxii.1–19.

HUPFELD assigns *v.*1–13, though doubtfully, to $E_2$, except the Jehovistic elements in *v.*11–12, and he gives *v.*14–18 to the Jehovist, writing as follows p.177,178 :—

The third passage [belonging to $E_2$] is the 'Trial of Abraham,' xxii.1–19, which includes in itself the Jehovistic parallel, and is bound up with it into one whole. In this whole only the conclusion is purely Jehovistic, and brings a not very necessary addition to the story, which, however, in the view of the Jehovist may certainly contain the proper end and object of the 'Trial' itself. The rest, with its constant use of the name 'Elohim,' seems equally to form one piece. Certainly, in any case, the call of the Angel '*out of heaven*,' *v.*11,12, with the command to stop, and with the name 'Angel of Jehovah,' as in *v.*15, must be taken out as a Jehovistic element, since in it the formula of the call corresponds with the Jehovistic in *v.*15, (but also with xxi.17 in $E_2$). So, too, 'thou hast not withheld thy son, thy only-one,' *v.*12, agrees with *v.*16; מְאוּמָה 'anything,' *v.*12, is elsewhere a J. formula, xxx.31, xxxix.6,9,23, xl.15; and 'fear Elohim,' *v.*12, is not necessarily 'Elohistic, see Job.i.1,8, ii.3, &c. Again, the catastrophe might be presented in a double form. —(i) *negatively*, in the command to do nothing to the son, because the object of the Trial was attained, (ii) *positively*, in the substitution of a ram for him; and one of these might, as far as any necessity is concerned, exist without the other; and this is true even of the positive form, since Abraham might be supposed, without any express command, to have regarded the sudden appearance of the ram as a *divine hint*, that he should offer this instead of his child, (as in the Greek myth of Iphigenia at Aulis and other similar myths.) And so, perhaps, other portions [of the section] might be taken out as due to the Jehovist. Still through this the complete well-adjusted whole would suffer loss, and the justification of such a separation is therefore very doubtful. On the other hand, I cannot conceal that the whole narrative in spirit and form seems to me to bear rather the stamp of the *Jehovist*, and certainly *we should not think of the Second Elohist but for the name 'Elohim,'* *v.*8,12, and הָאֱלֹהִים, *v.*1,3,9,—which fact here, as in some parts of the history of Joseph, is not supported by the internal phenomena, and perplexes criticism.

132. Thus it appears that HUPFELD is by no means confident that this section does not belong to the Jehovist, and indeed 'would not think of the Second Elohist for it, if the name was not Elohim' so persistently; and we have 'angel of Jehovah' in *v.*11. BOEHMER assigns *v.*1–14,19 to the Jehovist, and *v.*15–18 to the later Compiler,—with which view our own agrees, substantially. And for the use of 'Elohim,' with or without the article in this passage, we shall find parallels

enough in other Jehovistic passages (193). But the uncertainty here expressed by HUPFELD, as to whether this passage belongs to $E_2$ or J, tends strongly to confirm the suspicion already expressed, that these writers may possibly be one and the same, only writing at different periods. In fact, the passage before us may have been written by him at some point of time *between* his earliest insertions ($E_2$) and his later passages, so that he uses 'Elohim' still predominantly, but not exclusively; or the passage as originally written by himself may have been retouched by him afterwards, when the 'Jehovah' of *v.*11 crept in. See also the suggestion in (136).

133. xxii.1–18,19, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*1; 'and it came to pass after these things,' xxii.20, xxxix.7, xl.1, xlviii.1.

(ii) *v.*1,3,9, הָאֱלֹהִים as in xxvii.28, which both HUPFELD and BOEHMER assign to the Jehovist; but, according to our view, it occurs in the following J. passages, xxii.1,3,9,xxvii.28,xxxi.11, xxxv.7, xlii.18, xliv.16,xlv.8, xlviii.15,15,—also $E_2$ (110.ix).

(iii) *v.*1, 'and He said unto him, Abraham! and he said, Behold me!';
*comp.* 'and He said unto him, Jacob! and he said, Behold me!' xxxi.11;
'and He said Jacob, Jacob! and he said, Behold me!' xlvi.2.

(iv) *v.*2, אָהַב 'love,' xxii.2, xxiv.67, xxv.28,28, xxvii.4,9,14, xxix.18,20,30,32[d], xxxiv.3, xxxvii.3,4, xliv.20.

(v) *v.*2, 'get thee (לֶךְ לְךָ) unto the land &c.,' as in xii.1, *comp.* xxvii.43.

(vi) *v.*2, 'unto the land which I will (say unto thee=) tell thee of,' *v.*3,9, 'which Elohim had said unto him';
*comp.* 'in the land which I will tell thee of,' xxvi.2.

(vii) *v.*3, 'rise-early in the morning,' (99 xlix).
N.B. *v.*3, 'and Abraham rose-early in the morning, and saddled his ass';
*comp.* 'and Balaam rose-early in the morning, and saddled his ass,' N.xxii.21.

(viii) *v.*3,19, קוּם, 'arise' = start, (63.xv).

*(ix) *v.*4,13, 'lift-up the eyes and see,' (63.xv).

(x) *v.*4, מֵרָחוֹק, *merakhok*, 'from a distance,' as in xxxvii.18.

(xi) *v.*5, 'bow' = worship, as in xxiv.26,48,52.

(xii) *v.*6, 'and Abraham took &c., and placed (it) upon Isaac';
*comp.* 'and he took &c. placing (it) upon her shoulder,' xxi.14($E_2$).

(xiii) *v.*7, 'and Isaac *said* unto Abraham his father, and he *said*';
*comp.* 'and Elohim *said* to Israel . . . . and he *said*,' xlvi.2;

(xiv) *v.*9, 'and he built there the altar'; *comp.* xxvi.25, xxxv.7.

(xv) *v.*9, עָקַד, 'bind,' *comp.* עָקֹד, 'striped,' xxxi.8,10,12.

(xvi) *v.*10, שָׁחַט, 'slay,' as in xxxvii.31.

(xvii) *v.*11, 'and an angel of Jehovah called unto him out of heaven, and said';
*comp.* 'and an angel of Elohim called unto Hagar out of heaven, and said,' xxi.17($E_2$).

(xviii) *v.*11, 'angel of Jehovah,' as in xvi.7,9,10,11.

(xix) *v.*11, 'and He said, Abraham! Abraham! and he said, Behold me';
*comp.* 'and He said, Jacob! Jacob! and he said, Behold me,' xlvi.2.

(xx) *v.*12, 'lay no hand upon the youth';
*comp.* 'lay no hand on him,' xxxvii.22.

(xxi) *v.*12, עָשָׂה לְ־, 'do to,' (47.ix.)

(xxii) *v.*12, מְאוּמָה, 'anything,' xxii.12, xxx.31, xxxix.6,9,23—also $E_2$(xl.15).

(xxiii) *v.*12, 'thou (pron.) fearest Elohim'; *comp.* xxxii.11, xlii.18.

(xxiv) *v.*12, חָשַׂךְ, 'withhold,' as in xx.6($E_2$), and xxii.16(D).

(xxv) *v.*19, Abraham's residence at Beersheba, as in xxi.33,34

## 134. xxii.14–18.

Upon *v.*15–18 DELITZSCH notes as follows, *p.*415:

The narrative, which seems to be ended, goes on yet again. The voice of the angel of Jehovah resounds yet a second time, in order to crown Abraham's faithfulness with the reward of great promises. So solemnly as here, so triumphantly, has the promise been expressed nowhere else. Jehovah swears by Himself, in order to confirm His word, as He does *nowhere else in His intercourse with the Patriarchs.* And, further, He 'swears' here *for the first time* within the Sacred History; for His promise, that no such an Universal Flood should occur again, is indeed equivalent to an oath, but, as regards the words used, is not actually an oath. The lofty 'saith Jehovah' is, besides, in the introduction of divine utterances, *quite strange to the primeval history*: it is the *later seal of prophecy.* Also the repetition of כִּי in 17 is very expressive.

## 135. xxii.14–18, *Deuteronomist.*

The facts noted above by DELITZSCH, in the words *italicised,* imply that we have in *v.*15–18 a different writer from E, $E_2$, or J, who have all recorded Divine utterances, yet have nowhere introduced such formulæ as these; and his recognition—writing, as he does, from the traditionary point of view as far as he can,—that the lofty '*saith Jehovah*' in *v.*16 is 'the *later* seal of prophecy,' suggests that this passage *may* be due to the Deuteronomist, whose hand we have traced already in the manipulation of the first four Books of the Pentateuch.

But if *v.*15–18 belongs to D, then, most probably, *v.*14 is also his, since the original story comes to a proper close with *v.*2.

(i) *v.*14, 'as it is said this day, In the mount Jehovah will be seen,' or rather 'Jehovah will see,' *i.e.* 'see for himself, provide,' with reference to Abraham's words in *v.*8,—a proverb like that in x.9, 'therefore it is said, as Nimrod the mighty in hunting before Jehovah,' which we have already, on quite independent grounds, ascribed to D.

(ii) *v.*14, הַיּוֹם, 'this day,' very common in Deuteronomy, i.10,39, ii.18,25, iv.4,8,20,26,38,39,40, v.1,3,24,&c.—also $E_2$(xl.7, xli.9), J(xlii.13,32, xlvii.23).

(iii) *v.*15, 'and the angel of Jehovah called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time,' imitated from *v.*11.

(iv) *v.*16, 'by Myself have I sworn'; *comp.* E.xxxii.13, 'to whom Thou swarest by Thyself.'

(v) *v.*16, 'I have sworn,' in the mouth of Jehovah, as in D.i.35, x.11, xxxi.20, 21,23, G.xxvi.3(D), E.xxxiii.1, N.xiv.23, xxxii.11.

(vi) *v.*16, 'saith Jehovah,' as in N.xiv.28,—the only other instance in the Pentateuch of the employment of this very common *later* prophetical formula, which occurs just afterwards in the Bible in 1S.ii.30, and then first in 2K.ix.26.

*(vii) *v.*16, יַעַן אֲשֶׁר, 'because that,' D.i.36, Jo.xiv.14(D),—*nowhere else in the Pentateuch*, but not unusual in Jeremiah, xix.4, xxv.8, xxix.23,25,31, xxxv.18.

(viii) *v.*16, 'do this thing,' as in D.xvii.5, xxiv.18,22.

(ix) *v.*16, 'hast not withheld thy son, thine only-one,' imitated from *v.*12.

(x) *v.*17, 'blessing I will bless,' as in D.xv.4.

(xi) *v.*17, 'bless and multiply,' as in D.vii.13.

(xii) *v* 17, 'multiplying I will multiply thy seed'; *comp.* the numerous D. statements that Jehovah hath multiplied or will multiply Israel, D.i.10, vii.13, xiii.17, xxviii.63, xxx.5, also G.xv.5(D), xvi.10(D), xxvi.4(D).

(xiii) *v.*17, 'as the stars of heaven,' D.i.10,x.22,xxviii.62, G.xv.5(D), xxvi.4(D), E.xxxii.13.

*(xiv) *v.*17, 'as the sand which is on the lip of the sea,' Jo.xi.4(D).

(xv) *v.*17, 'thy seed shall inherit the gate of his enemies,' G.xxiv.60(D)—*nowhere else in the Bible.*

(xvi) *v.*17, יָרַשׁ, 'inherit,' (79.vi).

*(xvii) *v.*18, 'all nations of the earth,' (98.iii).

*(xviii) *v.*18, 'by thy seed shall all nations of the earth *bless themselves*,' (98.iv).

*(xix) *v.*18, עֵקֶב אֲשֶׁר, 'because that,' as in xxvi.5(D),—*nowhere else in the Bible*, except in 2S.xii.6; but עֵקֶב occurs in D.vii.12, viii.20, N.xiv.24.

(xx) *v.*18, 'hearken to (בְּ) the voice of,' D.i.45, iv.30,viii.20,ix.23,&c. (*twenty-three* times in Deut.), G.xxvi.5(D),—also $E_2$(xxi.12), J(180.ix).

136. From the above analysis we conclude with some degree of confidence that *v.*14–18 does really belong to the Deuteronomist, and this corresponds nearly with BOEHMER's view, who assigns *v.*15–18 to the Compiler of Josiah's time. But, if so, then it is plain that the writer wished to explain the name 'Jehovah-

Jireh,' *v.*14, and therefore *required* that the name 'Jehovah' should appear somewhere near at hand in the context. May it be that $E_2$ wrote originally this passage, as HUPFELD supposes, and in *v.*11 wrote just exactly as he had done before in xxi.17,—

'and the angel of *Elohim* called unto him out of heaven, and said,'

and then that the Editor has changed this 'Elohim' into 'Jehovah' in order to obtain the name which he required for his derivation in *v.*14?

This may be the real account of the matter, more especially as in *v.*8 we actually have '*Elohim*-Jireh,' to which expression the insertion in *v.*14 is evidently meant to refer. The case would then be similar to that already noticed in xvi.11 (86.xii.N.B); only there the *Jehovist* has left the inconsistency, which the *Deuteronomist* may have here sought to remove.

137. xxii.20–24, *Jehovist.*

*(i) *v.*20, 'and it came to pass after these things,' (133.i).

*(ii) *v.*20, 'it was told to Abraham';

*comp.* 'and it was told to Rebekah,' xxvii.42;
'and it was told to Laban,' xxxi.22;
'and it was told to Tamar,' xxxviii.13;
'and it was told to Judah,' xxxviii.24;
'and one told to Jacob,' xlviii.2.

(iii) *v.*20, 'Milcah' and 'Nahor,' as in xi.29.

*(iv) *v.*23, יָלַד, 'beget,' (5.xxvi).

(v) *v.*24, 'and her name Reumah,' (85.iii.N.B.).

N.B. The main object, apparently, both of xi.29 and xxii.20–24, is to show more distinctly that *Rebekah* also was of the kindred stem. Accordingly, Laban, her brother, is not here mentioned at all.

Nahor, it will be observed, has *twelve* sons, as Ishmael, xxv.13–15, and Jacob; and he has eight by his wife, four by his concubine, as Jacob had eight by Leah and Rachel, and four by Bilhah and Zilpah.

138. xxiii.1–20.

DELITZSCH observes on this chapter, *p.*423:—

It is impossible to mistake here the narrative-style of the Elohist,—diffuse, delighting in repetitions, but lifelike and archaic. The occurrence of the name 'Elohim' in *v.*6, of course, proves nothing. But the whole mode of description

does, which here falls back upon the favourite expressions of the Elohist; and which so completely reproduces antiquity, that we find ourselves in the midst of the relations of that time, with its formulæ of courtesy, and its mode of transacting business, and might almost believe that the narrator had had before him the actual original of the contract of purchase.

139. xxiii.1-20, *Elohist.*

(i) *v.*1, date of Sarah's death (10.vii).

(ii) *v.*1, מֵאָה, 'hundred,' as in xvii.17—also J (95.xxxiii).

*(iii) *v.*1, 'the years of the life of Sarah';

*comp.* 'the days of the years of the life of Abraham,' xxv.7;

'the years of the life of Ishmael,' xxv.17;

'the days of Isaac,' xxxv.28;

'the days of the years of thy life,' xlvii.8;

'the days of the years of my sojournings,' xlvii.9;

'the days of the years of my life,' xlvii.9;

'the days of the years of the life of my fathers,' xlvii.9;

'the days of Jacob, of the years of his life,' xlvii.28.

(iv) *v.*4, אָנֹכִי, 'I,' occurs only here in E(19.ix).

*(v) *v.*4,9,20, אֲחֻזָּה, 'possession,' (95.xxiii).

(vi) *v.*5,13,14, לוּ, 'would that,' as in xvii.18.

N.B. In the text of *v.*5,14, there now stands לוֹ, 'to him.' But there is no other instance in the Bible, where לֵאמֹר, 'saying,' is followed, as it would be here; by לוֹ, and the cases are very rare indeed, where it is followed by any word such as אֲלֵיהֶם, 'unto them,' L.xi.1. It seems, therefore, to be most unlikely that in this one chapter so unusual a construction should occur *twice.* Whereas, if we transfer לוֹ from the end of *v.*5,14, to the beginning of *v.*6,15, and point it לוּ, we shall have it in each case followed by an imperative, exactly as it stands in the text in *v.*13.

(vii) *v.*6, נָשִׂיא, 'prince,' (95.xxxvii).

*(viii) *v.*9, the cave of Machpelah is repeatedly described by E, with almost legal precision:—

'Entreat for me to Ephron the son of Zohar, that he may give to me the cave of Machpelah, which is his, which is at the end of his field; for full money shall he give it to me in the midst of you, for a possession of a burial-place,' xxiii.8,9;

'The field of Ephron, which is in Machpelah, which is before Mamre, the field and the cave which is in it, and all the trees which are in the field, which are in all its border round about, were assured to Abraham for a possession before the eyes of the sons of Heth,' xxiii.17,18;

'The cave of the field of Machpelah before Mamre,' xxiii.19;

'The field and the cave which is in it were assured to Abraham for a possession of a burial-place from the sons of Heth,' xxiii.20;

'The cave of Machpelah in the field of Ephron the son of Zohar the Hittite, which is before Mamre, the field which Abraham bought from the sons of Heth,' xxv.9,10;

'The cave which is in the field of Ephron the Hittite, the cave which is in the field of Machpelah, which is before Mamre, in the land of Canaan, which Abraham bought with the field from Ephron the Hittite for a possession of a burial-place,' xlix.29,30;

'The purchase of the field and of the cave which is in it was from the sons of Heth,' xlix.32;

'The cave of the field of Machpelah, which Abraham bought with the field, for a possession of a burial-place, from Ephron the Hittite, before Mamre,' l.13.

N.B. The cave of Machpelah is not mentioned anywhere else in the Bible.

(ix) *v.*16, שָׁמַע אֶל, 'hearken unto,' as in xxiii.16, xxviii.7, xxx.17,22,—also $E_2$(xxi.17), J(xvi.11, xxxiv.17,24):

E never uses שָׁמַע בְּ, which is used by $E_2$(xxi.12), J(xxvii.8,13, xxx.6[b]), D(xxii.18, xxvi.5).

140. HUPFELD and BOEHMER, and indeed almost all critics, assign this chapter to E, except that BOEHMER says on *v.*2, *p.*213:—

'These words, 'and Abraham *came* to mourn for Sarah,' *may* be understood to speak of Abraham's *coming* to Hebron, (where Sarah found herself no one knows why,) as soon as he heard the account of her death, in which case he may be supposed to have come from *Beersheba*, where he lived according to xxii.19. [But this is only the statement of J; there is nothing to tell us where he then lived according to E, who has merely said, in his next preceding notice of place,' 'Abraham dwelt in the land of Canaan,' xiii.12[a].] With this interpretation, the words can only come from the *Compiler*, [*i.e.* since E has not said anything about his living at Beersheba.] But they may mean 'and Abraham *went-in*,' *i.e.* into Sarah's tent, &c.'

Probably the latter supposition is the correct one, Abraham being really supposed by E to be living all along at Hebron. But in any case it is not necessary to supply 'from Beersheba'; he might have come from any other place to Hebron.

141. xxiv.1–67, *Jehovist*, except *v.*59,60.

*(i) *v.*1, 'and Abraham was old, advanced in days';

*comp.* 'and Abraham and Sarah were old, advanced in days,' xviii.11.

(ii) *v.*1, 'Jehovah blessed Abraham in everything,' refers to the promise, 'I will bless thee,' xii.2.

*(iii) *v.*1, 'and Jehovah blessed Abraham,' *v.*31, 'thou blessed of Jehovah,' *v.*35, 'and Jehovah hath blessed my master';

*comp.* 'and Jehovah blessed him,' xxvi.12;
'Jehovah hath blessed me,' xxx.27;
'Jehovah hath blessed thee,' xxx.30;

'Jehovah blessed the house of the Egyptian,' xxxix.5;
'the blessing of Jehovah was upon all that he had,' xxxix.5.

(iv) *v.*2,5, &c., the head 'servant' of Abraham is here spoken of repeatedly (*fourteen* times, *v.*2,5,9,10,14,17,34,35,53,59,61$^{b}$,65.65,66), but never *named*, as he is in xv.2—which seems to show that the latter is a *supplementary* story, (as we suppose,) by *another* and a *later* hand (that of D).

(v) *v.*2, 'ruling over all,' as in xlv.8,26.

(vi) *v.*2, כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ, 'all which he had,' (59.xxviii).

*(vii) *v.*2, 'put, I pray thee, thy hand under my thigh,' as in xlvii.29.

(viii) *v.*3, 'I will swear thee by Jehovah,' *v.*3,7,9,37, 'swear,' *v.*8,41,41, 'oath';
*comp.* 'Jacob sware by the Dread of his father Isaac,' xxxi.53;
'swear to me by Elohim,' xxi.23($E_2$);
*comp.* also (126.x).

(ix) *v.*3, 'Jehovah, Elohim of heaven and Elohim of earth,' *v.*7, 'Jehovah, E. of heaven,' *v.*12,27,42,48, 'Jehovah, E. of Abraham my master,' (47.xii).

N.B. ILGEN observes, p.488, Abraham cannot say 'Elohim of *my father*' (Terah, the idolater, Jo.xxiv.2); so the writer makes him use the phrases in *v.*3,7. But see 'E. of their father (Terah),' xxxi. 51, and (220.lxx.N.B.)

(x) *v.*3,4,7,37,38,40, 'take a wife for my son,' *v.*48, 'take my master's brother's daughter for his son';
*comp.* 'his mother took for him a wife,' xxi.21 (120).

(xi) *v.*3, 'in the midst (בְּקִרְבּ) of whom I dwell,' (97.xxi):
E has 'Ephron was dwelling in the midst (בְּתוֹךְ) of the sons of Heth,' xxiii.10.

*(xii) *v.*4, 'unto my land and unto my kindred,' *v.*7, 'out of the land of my kindred,' (58.ii).

*(xiii) *v.*5,39, אוּלַי, 'perhaps,' (86.ii).

(xiv) *v.*7, 'who took me out of my father's house,' refers to the command, 'Get thee out of thy land, and out of thy kindred, and out of thy father's house,' xii.1.

(xv) *v.*7, 'who *spake* unto me, and who *sware* unto me, saying, *To thy seed will I give this land*,' refers to xii.7(J), where Jehovah *speaks* to Abram, saying, 'To thy seed will I give this land,' and to xvii.7,8,(E), where Elohim 'establishes a covenant' with Abraham = *swears* to him, saying, '*I will give* to thee, and *to thy seed* after thee, the land of thy sojournings, all *the land of Canaan*.'

N.B. The reference cannot be to xxii.16–18, the only place in Genesis where Jehovah is spoken of as formally 'swearing' to Abraham; because nothing is there said in the oath about 'giving the land' either to Abraham himself or to his seed, to which last particular *v.*7 expressly and, indeed, *exclusively* refers. This agrees with our view, that xxii.16–18 is a later insertion by D, and therefore could not have been referred to by J.

Again, in xv.18 we read 'unto thy seed do I give this land'; but this passage also we ascribe to D, and therefore suppose that J cannot here be referring to it. In fact, xv.18 says no more than is said in xii 7, xvii.7,8; *i.e.* it speaks of no *oath* of Jehovah, but only of a *covenant*, by which He pledged Himself to give the land to Abraham's seed, just as He does in xvii.7,8. Observe also that *v.*7 quotes the

identical phrase of xii.7 with the verb as there, אֶתֵּן, not, as in xv.18, נָתַתִּי. It is plain, therefore, that the 'covenant' of Jehovah was regarded by J as equivalent to an 'oath.'

(xvi) *v.*7,40, 'His angel;' *comp.* 'the angel of Jehovah,' xvi.7,9,10,11, xxii.11.

*(xvii) *v.*8,21,38,41,49, אִם־לֹא, 'if not,' (97.xxx).

(xviii) *v.*9, 'concerning this thing,' as in xix.21.

(xix) *v.*10, קוּם, 'arise,' = start, (63.xxv).

*(xx) *v.*10,11, &c., 'camels,' (59.xxiii).

(xxi) *v.*11, 'time of evening,' as in viii.11.

*(xxii) *v.*12, הַקְרָה, 'make-to-meet,' = speed, give success, xxvii.20, N.xxxv.11, —*nowhere else in the Bible.*

(xxiii) *v.*12,14, 'do mercy with (עִם),' (99.xxxviii).

*(xxiv) *v.*13,43, נִצָּב עַל, 'standing by' (97.v,vi).

*(xxv) *v.*14, נָטָה, 'extend,' (59.x).

(xxvi) *v.*14,44, הוֹכַחְתָּ, 'correct, set right,' xxiv.14,44, xxxi.37,42, – also $E_2$ (110.xxviii).

*(xxvii) *v.*14, 'thy servant,' (97.x).

*(xxviii) *v.*15,45, טֶרֶם, 'not yet,' (3.ii).

(xxix) *v.*15, 'Rebekah, who was born to Bethuel the son of Milcah, the wife of Nahor, Abraham's brother,' *v.*24,47, 'I am daughter of Bethuel the son of Milcah, whom she bare to Nahor';

*comp.* 'and the name of Nahor's wife was Milcah,' xi.29;

'and Bethuel begat Rebekah;' these eight Milcah bare to Nahor Abraham's brother,' xxii.23.

(xxx) *v.* 16, 'goodly of form,' as in xxvi.7, *comp.* 'fair of form,' (59.xvi).

*(xxxi) *v.* 16, 'know,' carnally (5.i).

*(xxxii) *v.*17, 'run to meet,' (97.vii).

*(xxxiii) *v.*17,43, 'a little water,' as in xviii.4, *comp.* (97.xiv).

*(xxxiv) *v.*18,46, 'hasten and lower,' *v.*20, 'hasten and empty';

*comp.* xliv.11, xlv.9,13,—also xviii.6,7, xxvii.20, xliii.30.

*(xxxv) *v.*20, 'ran to draw,' *v.*28, 'ran and told,' (97.viii).

*(xxxvi) *v.*22, 'and it came-to-pass as the camels had finished to drink,' (97.xlvii).

*(xxxvii) *v.*23,25,54, לִין, 'pass the night,' (99.viii).

(xxxviii) *v.*23,42,49, יֵשׁ, 'there is,' xxiv.23,42,49, xxviii.16,xxxix.4,5,8,xlii.1,2, xliii.4,7, xliv.20, xlvii.6:

E has it *once*, xxiii.8.

*(xxxix) *v.*25,32, מִסְפּוֹא, 'forage,' xxiv.25,32, xlii.27, xliii.24.

(xl) *v.*26,48,52, 'bow,' = worship (133.xi).

*(xli) *v.*27, 'Blessed be Jehovah, the Elohim of my master Abraham'; so *v.*48; *comp.* 'Blessed be Jehovah, the Elohim of Shem,' ix.26.

*(xlii) *v.*27, עָזַב, 'forsake,' (3.xviii).

*(xliii) *v.*27,49, 'mercy and truth,' xlvii.29, 'mercies and truth,' xxxii.10.

*(xliv) *v.*28, 'according to these things,' (97.xxxix.)

(xlv) *v.*29, 'and his name Laban,' (85.iii.N.B).

*(xlvi) *v.*30, 'at his seeing,' xxiv.30, xxxix.13, xliv.31, *comp.* 'at his hearing,' xxiv.30, xxvii 34, xxix.13, xxxiv.7, xxxix.15,19, 'at his drawing back his hand,' xxxviii.29, 'at her speaking,' xxxix.10, 'at my coming,' xliv.30.

*(xlvii) *v.*31,49,63, פָּנָה, 'face towards,' (97.xxxi).

(xlviii) *v.*32, 'wash the feet,' (97.xv).

(xlix) *v.*35, 'Jehovah hath blessed my master greatly, and he is become great'; *comp.* 'I will bless thee, and make great thy name,' xii.2.

(l) *v.*35, 'flocks and herds, and silver and gold, and servants and maids, and camels and he-asses,' (59.xxii).

(li) *v.*36, כֹּל-אֲשֶׁר-לוֹ, 'all which he has,' (59.xxviii).

(lii) *v.* 40, 'before whom I walk';

*comp.* 'before whom my fathers have walked,' xlviii. 15:

E has the phrase, xvii.1, *comp.* v.22,24, vi.9;

but the formula was proverbial; *comp.* 1K.ii.4, iii.6, ix.4, 2K.xx.3, Ps.cxvi.9.

(liii) *v.*42, 'my way which I go,' (99.xii);

(liv) *v.*45, 'speak unto the heart,' (45.v).

(lv) *v.*49 'do mercy with (אֵת),' xxiv.49, xxxii.10(11), *comp.* (99.xxxviii).

(lvi) *v.*49, 'upon the right or upon the left,' *comp.* xiii.9.

*(lvii) *v.*52, 'bow to the earth,' (97.ix.).

*(lviii) *v.*53, בֶּגֶד, 'vestment,' xxiv.53, xxvii.15,27, xxviii.20, xxxvii.29, xxxviii. 14,19, xxxix.12,12,13,15,16,18, xli.42.

(lix) *v.*56, אַחַר, 'delay,' xxiv.56, xxxii.4(5), xxxiv.19.

*(lx) *v.*60, שָׂנֵא, 'hate,' xxiv.60, xxvi.27, xxix.31,33$^{b}$, xxxvii.4,5,8.

(lxi) *v.*62, the well 'Lakhai-roi,' as in xvi.14.

(lxii) *v.*62, 'land of the Negeb,' as in $E_2$ (xx.1), N.xiii.29, Jo.xv.19, Ju.i.15,—*nowhere else in the Bible.*

(lxiii) *v.*63,64, 'lift up the eyes and see,' (63.xv).

N.B. In *v.*65 the servant uses the phrase 'my master' of *Isaac*, having all along used it of *Abraham*: but this, of course, is very natural.

*(lxiv) *v.*67, נִחַם, 'comfort,' (11.ii).

(lxv) *v.*67, 'Isaac comforted himself after his mother,' referring to the death of Sarah, xxiii.2(E).

N.B. Boehmer justly observes, *p.*213, that there is no *Jehovistic* record of the *death* of Sarah; and hence he gives only *v.*67$^{a}$ to J, and supposes the writer to mean that Isaac brought his bride 'into the tent of Sarah' in order to *present* her to his mother, to whose care he consigned her during the preparation of the marriage festivities: and then he gives *v.*67$^{b}$ to the Compiler. But this is quite unnecessary on our view of the supplementary character of the J. narrative.

142. As Sarah died at Hebron, xxiii.2, her 'tent,' into which Isaac brought Rebekah, *v.*67, must have been there. And to Hebron also the servant brought Rebekah, returning naturally with her to Abraham, who may have been supposed to have

settled there, after the acquisition of the property in xxiii (*comp.* xxv.9), whereas previously he lived, according to J, xxii. 19, at *Beersheba*. Accordingly, J here makes Isaac to be just—

'come from going to the well, Lakhai-roi, for he dwelt in the land of the Negeb,' *v.*62;

that is, Isaac may have been supposed to have lived with his mother at Hebron till her death, and then, after having taken part in her burial, to have gone for a season to see after affairs at Beersheba, where he afterwards lived according to J(xxviii.10), whereas Abraham removed to Hebron. Isaac may have been supposed, perhaps, to have done this while his servant was gone to Charran; and he has now come back to await his return, and so is ready to receive Rebekah. At first he instals her in his mother's tent, which might still be supposed to be standing in good order, and, perhaps kept ready for her reception; since Sarah died when Isaac was 37 years old, *comp.* xvii.17, xxiii.1, and he took Rebekah to wife within three years, when he was 40 years old, xxv.20.

143. It must be observed, however, that E mentions no dwelling-place of any of the patriarchs *except Hebron*,—*comp.* 'by the terebinths of Mamre, which are in Hebron,' xiii.18(J)—and he seems to assume that this was the settled abode of each of them, at least *after* the purchase of land recorded in xxiii; for the expression in xxiii.2, 'Sarah died in Kirjath-Arba, and Abraham *came* to mourn for Sarah and to weep for her,' implies rather that Abraham was not at that time living at Hebron—unless, as Boehmer suggests (140), it should be rendered, 'and Abraham *went-in*' *i.e.* into Sarah's tent, &c. However, E makes Abraham to die and be buried at Hebron, xxv.9, at which place, as he also expressly tells us, both Abraham and Isaac sojourned, xxxv.27, and Isaac and Rebekah were buried, xlix.31; and he makes also Jacob say that he buried Leah at Hebron, xlix.31, where also Jacob was living, according to J(xxxvii.14), at the time of Joseph's being carried off to Egypt.

144. xxiv.59,60.

On *v.*61$^{b}$ KNOBEL observes, *Gen.* p.204:

> This clause does not fit in well with what precedes, and one and the same writer can hardly have told the story in this way.

Rather, it is *v.*59 which does not 'fit in well' with what *follows* in *v.*61; that is to say, the statement, 'and they sent away Rebekah, &c., and they blessed Rebekah, and said,' &c. could hardly have been *followed* in the original narrative by *v.*61$^{a}$, 'and Rebekah *arose*'; they can hardly be supposed to have blessed her, with the words here recorded, *before* she 'arose' =was ready to start. But *v.*61$^{a}$ contains 'the camels,' *comp.* *v.*10,11,14, &c. 63,64; and, indeed, they were expressly provided for Rebekah's use in *v.*10; and there is nothing inconsistent between *v.*61$^{a}$ and *v.*61$^{b}$. We conclude, therefore, that *v.*61 is part of the original J. story; and the following phenomena seem to point to D as the interpolator of *v.*59,60.

145. xxiv.59,60, *Deuteronomist.*

(i) *v.*59, 'Abraham's servant and *his men*'; hitherto we have had, 'the men that were with him,' *v.*32,54.

(ii) *v.*59, '*their* sister,' *v.*60, '*our* sister': the *plural* form is not used elsewhere in the story, and the term 'sister' is scarcely suitable to be used by the persons concerned, 'her brother and her mother,' *v.*53,55, and perhaps her grandfather, *v.*50.

(iii) *v.*59, Rebekah's '*nurse*' is named, but not her '*maidens*,' as in *v.*61, where nothing is said about the 'nurse,' who occurs again in xxxv.8(D).

(iv) *v.*60, רִבְבָה, 'ten-thousands,' D.xxxii.30, xxxiii.2,17, L.xxvi.8, N.x.36: in D.xxxiii.17 we have both 'thousands' and 'ten thousands,' as here.

*(v) *v.*60, 'thy seed shall inherit the gate of his enemies,' (135.xv).

146. xxv.1–6, *Jehovist.*

This passage evidently corresponds to xxii.20–24, to which it is a kind of pendant.

*(i) *v.*1, 'added and took' (5.iv).

(ii) *v.*1, 'and her name Keturah,' (85.iii.N.B.).

*(iii) *v.*3, יָלַד 'beget,' (5.xxvi).

(iv) *v.*4, 'Asshurim,' 'Letushim,' 'Leummim,' plural names, as in x.13,14.

(v) *v.*5, כָּל-אֲשֶׁר-לוֹ, 'all which was his,' (59.xxviii).

(vi) *v.*5, 'and Abraham gave all which he had to Isaac';
*comp.* 'and he hath given to him all which he has,' xxiv.36.

(vii) *v.*6, פִּלֶגֶשׁ, 'concubine,' as in xxii.24.

(viii) *v.*6, 'while he was yet alive,' *comp.* xxv.6,xliii.7,27,28,xlv.3,26,28,xlvi.30.

(ix) *v.*6,6, קֶדֶם, 'east,' (3.vi).

N.B. By 'the sons of the *concubines* whom Abraham had,' J seems to mean Ishmael, the son of *Hagar*, and the six sons of *Keturah*: at least, we do not read of any other wives or concubines, which Abraham had besides Sarah.

In *v.*3 Sheba and Dedan are derived otherwise than in x.7 and x.28. But so, too, the account of their origin differs in x.7 and in x.28: so that all these three notices, notwithstanding these variations, may be due to the same writer, who probably betrays in this manner some uncertainty in his information, or, perhaps, some bifurcation in the tribes themselves.

## 147. xxv.7–11[a], *Elohist.*

(i) *v.*7, date of Abraham's death, (10.vii).

*(ii) *v.*7, 'and these are the days of the years of the life of Abraham,' (139.iii).

*(iii) *v.*7, מֵאָה, 'hundred,' (10.ix).

*(iv) *v.*8, 'and Abraham expired and died, and was gathered unto his people';

*comp.* 'and he (Ishmael) expired and died, and was gathered unto his people,' xxv.17;

'and Isaac expired and died, and was gathered unto his people,' xxxv.29;

'I shall be gathered unto my people,' xlix.29;

'and he (Jacob) expired, and was gathered unto his people,' xlix.33.

*comp.* also with the expression, 'be gathered unto his people,' the other Elohistic formula, 'be cut off from his people,' xvii.14.

*(v) *v.*8, גָּוַע, 'expire,' (19.xi).

*(vi) *v.*8, 'old and full,' *comp.* 'old and full of days,' xxxv.29.

*(vii) *v.*9, 'and his sons, Isaac and Ishmael, buried him';

*comp.* 'and his sons, Esau and Jacob, buried him,' xxxv.29;

'and his sons . . . buried him,' l.13.

*(viii) *v.*9,10, the cave of Machpelah accurately described, (139.viii).

*(ix) *v.*10, 'there was buried Abraham and Sarah his wife';

*comp.* 'there they buried Abraham and Sarah his wife,' xlix.31.

(x) *v.*11[a], 'after the death of Abraham, Elohim blessed Isaac his son,' (1.v).

N.B. The words in *v.*11[a], 'after the death of Abraham,' seem to be used with express reference to the special language of the E. promise to Abraham, 'to thee and to thy seed *after thee*,' (46.xviii), which no other writer in Genesis uses. We have seen that the Elohist does not record any separate appearance of El Shaddai to Isaac (95.xxi.N.B.): he makes him inherit the 'blessing of Abraham,' xxviii.4.

## 148. xxv.11[b], *Jehovist.*

According to the Elohist, the three Patriarchs all dwelt by the terebinths of Mamre at Hebron—at least, after the pur-

chase of the land there (143). But $E_2$ and J show a great desire to connect them closely with Beersheba and the well Lakhai-roi, $E_2$(xx.1, xxi.32), J(xxi.33, xxii.19, xxiv.62, xxv.11$^b$, xxvi.23, xxviii.10, xlvi.1,5).

(i) the well 'Lakhai-roi,' as in xvi.14, xxiv.62.

(ii) בְּ, 'by,' as in xxxv.4.

N.B. HUPFELD, *p.*208, suggests that *v.*11$^b$ may, perhaps, have belonged originally after xxiv.67. But this would require that we should translate *v.*62 'and Isaac *had just come to* (*comp.* il vient d'arriver) the well Lakhai-roi,' of which construction, however, HUPFELD says, *p.*29, he 'knows no other instance.' Besides which, Sarah's 'tent,' *v.*67, would in that case have been at *Lakhai-roi*, and not at *Hebron*, as we should infer from xxiii.2.

Upon our view, the insertion of this notice, completely disjoined as it is from the Jehovistic context before and after, is another strong indication of the supplementary character of the Jehovist's work.

149. xxv.12–18.

My judgment upon this passage differs from that of HUPFELD and BOEHMER. It consists only of a very few verses, and is in itself of no material consequence. The decision in this case, however, will be found to affect some other genealogical passages of greater length and importance. It is, therefore, desirable to consider carefully the arguments of these eminent critics before I proceed to explain my own view.

HUPFELD gives to E *v.*12,16$^b$,17, writing as follows, *p.*59–61:

'Far more evident is the derivation from E of the account of Ishmael's sons and of his death, xxv.12–18; since *v.*17 (age and death) bears distinctly his stamp, and the expression, 'twelve princes,' manifestly refers to xvii.20. Further, the manner in which the two sons follow each other in the superscriptions,—*v.*12, 'and these are the generations of Ishmael,' *v.*19, 'and these are the generations of Isaac,' immediately after their father's death [and burial, *v.*7–10],—agrees with what we find in the parallel case of Esau and Jacob,—['and these are the generations of Esau,' xxxvi.1, 'these are the generations of Jacob,' xxxvii.2$^a$, immediately after their father's death and burial, xxxv.28,29.] And, if this similarity is due to E, it would secure for this passage a place in the E. story.

But, notwithstanding this, I can only regard the notice *in its present form* as Jehovistic, for the following reasons:—

(i) *v.*13, 'these are the names, &c.,' as usual in x, xxxvi;

(ii) *v.*13, 'by their names,' 'after their generations,' *v.*16, 'by their villages, and by their kraals,' referring to their mode of dwelling, as in x;

(iii) *v.*18$^{a}$, the geographical datum as to the extension of their dwelling-place, resembling that about the sons of Joktan, x.30;

(iv) *v.*18$^{b}$, the verbal reference to the J. prophecy in xvi.12;

(v) *v.*17, which records the age and death of Ishmael, and belongs to E, interrupts the connection between the tribes, *v.*16, and their dwelling-place, *v.*18, (where the first words, 'and they abode,' refer to 'the sons' in *v.*16,) and thus betrays itself to be a foreign element.

Hence *v.*17 alone belongs *certainly* to E. But, since the 'twelve princes' *v.*16$^{b}$, who have been already foretold in xvii.20, appear also to belong to it, it is probable that the superscription, *v.*12, is also a portion of it, which was then followed originally either by the *names* of the twelve sons, or, perhaps, merely by the general notice about them, with that poetical formula out of xvii.20, as the fulfilment of the prophecy, together with the account of the age and death of Ishmael. Then, upon this foundation, the Jehovist or the Compiler introduced the names, *v.*13–15,16$^{a}$, together with the datum as to their dwelling-place, *v.*18, with a reference to xvi.12.

150. There can be no doubt that *v.*18 *is* decidedly Jehovistic, so that (iii) and (iv) of HUPFELD'S arguments are at once admitted; but at the same time the break of connection, noticed in (v), disappears, when this foreign element, *v.*18, is removed. We demur, however, to his other reasons, and reply to them thus:—

(i) The phrase 'these are the names' does *not* occur in x; whereas the complete formula, the same as here, 'and these are the names of the sons of &c.,' *does* occur identically in E.i.1, which HUPFELD and BOEHMER assign without doubt to E; and a similar formula occurs in xxv.16$^{a}$, xxxvi.10,40, xlvi.8,—*all* which we ascribe to E,—and *nowhere else in Genesis.*

(ii) 'after their generations' *does* occur once in x.32, and in no other passage of Genesis; but the word here rendered 'generations' (תּוֹלְדוֹת) is very common in E, *e.g.* ii.4$^{a}$,v.1,vi.9, &c. So that E might very well have used this particular formula, *if* he uses any formula of this kind at all; and we see that he *does* use them in vi.9, 'by his generations (דוֹרוֹת),' xvii.7,9,12, 'after their (your) generations,' and xxv.16$^{b}$, 'after their populations (לְאֻמֹּת).'

(iii) On the other hand, not one of the other three formulæ here employed, 'by their names,' 'by their villages,' 'by their kraals,'—any more than 'after their populations,' *v.*16$^{b}$—is used in x, where so many different formulæ are employed, *viz.* 'by their lands,' *v.*5,20,31, 'after their families,' *v.*5,20,31, 'by their nations,' *v.*20,32, 'after their tongues,' *v.*20,31, 'after their nations,' *v.*31. Hence these three would certainly rather appear *not* to be Jehovistic formulæ.

We see no reason, therefore, at present for *not* assigning

*v.*13 to E; and, if so, then the whole passage *v.*13–16 is most probably his. Clearly, the same writer, who had recorded the prediction of the 'twelve princes' that were to 'go forth out of' Ishmael in xvii.20, would be likely to record also its fulfilment here as in *v.*16$^{b}$, and, indeed, must be supposed to have penned the former passage with an express view to the introduction of the latter. And why should he not have mentioned also their *names*, as in *v.*13–15? HUPFELD admits that he has given us the names of Esau's *five* sons in xxxvi.1–8. Why, then, should he not also have named the 'twelve princes,' whom he has announced in such a marked manner beforehand in xvii.20?

151. BOEHMER adds nothing to HUPFELD'S reasons for withdrawing *v.*13–16$^{a}$ from E. But he gives only *v.*17 to E, and the rest, and even *v.*19 besides, to the Jehovist, except *v.*16$^{b}$, which he ascribes to the Compiler, writing as follows, p.84,85 :—

> HUPFELD'S view of the composition of the whole Book forbids him to regard the Jehovist as having retouched or supplemented E, since he rightly believes both authors to have written independently of each other. Hence only the Compiler could have added *v.*16$^{b}$, [as a sort of gloss upon xvii.20.]
>
> Further, HUPFELD himself observes that *v.*17, 'since it interrupts the connection between *v.*16 and *v.*18, betrays itself as a foreign element.' Certainly, what remains, after striking out *v.*17, *forms a complete whole*, in the style and phraseology of the Jehovist, which, HUPFELD says, may be felt sounding through it. Even in assigning *v.*16$^{b}$ to the Compiler, we are following only on the track of HUPFELD.
>
> Also, the two superscriptions, *v.*12,19, whose relation to each other HUPFELD compares appositely with xxxvi.1, xxxvii.2$^{a}$,—though assigned by him to E,—are certainly, as well as those two passages, to be ascribed to the Jehovist.

Here, again, we agree with BOEHMER'S judgment that 'what remains, after striking out *v.*17, forms a complete whole.' But we have seen above that there is nothing as yet produced in *v.*13–16, which really makes it 'Jehovistic in style and phraseology.' Rather, there is much, as HUPFELD himself allows, and as we shall show in the analysis below, which agrees closely with E.

We shall consider in their proper place the other two passages, xxxvi.1, xxxvii.2$^{a}$, which with HUPFELD we assign to E.

## 152. xxv.12–17, *Elohist.*

*(i) *v.*12, 'and these are the generations of Ishmael the son of Abraham,' ; *comp.* xxv.19, and see (2.iii).

(ii) *v.*12, 'Hagar the Egyptian Sarah's maid,' as in xvi.1,3.

(iii) *v.*12, 'which Hagar bare to Abraham,' as xvi.15,16.

N.B. The minuteness of the description in *v.*12, 'Ishmael, Abraham's son, whom Hagar the Egyptian, Sarah's maid, bare to Abraham,' points plainly to E, who had not already written the long accounts about Ishmael in xvi,xxi.

*(iv) *v.*13, 'and these are the names of the sons of Ishmael,' *v.*16, 'and these are their names' ;

*comp.* 'these are the names of the sons of Esau,' xxxvi.10;

'and these are the names of the clans of Esau,' xxxvi.40;

'and these are the names of the sons of Israel,' xlvi.8, E.i.1.

(v) *v.*13, 'by (בְּ) their names,' 'after (לְ) their generations (תּוֹלְדֹת),' *v.*16, 'by their villages,' 'by their kraals,' 'after their population';

*comp.* the phrases 'by his generations (דּוֹר),' vi.9, 'after their generations,' xvii.7,9, 'after your generations,' xvii.12;

*comp.* also 'after their families,' 'after their places,' 'by their names,' xxxvi.40, 'after their habitations,' xxxvi.43, which we also ascribe to E; and observe, as in (150.iii), that only the first of these occurs among the numerous Jehovistic formulæ in x, so that the others may be rather regarded as *not* Jehovistic.

(vi) *v.*13, תּוֹלְדֹת, 'generations,' very common in E,—ii.4ᵃ, v.1, vi.9, xi.10,27, xxv.12,13,19, xxxvi.1,9, xxxvii.2ᵃ; also J(x.1,32).

*(vii) *v.*13, 'by their names,' as in xxxvi.40.

(viii) *v.*13, 'the firstborn of Ishmael, Nebaioth';

*comp.* 'the firstborn of Jacob, Reuben,' xxxv.23, xlvi.8;

'Eliphaz, the firstborn of Esau,' xxxvi.15:

J has in his genealogies 'Canaan begat Sidon his firstborn,' x.15, 'Milcah bare . . . Huz his firstborn,' xxii.20,21; but these formulæ are somewhat different in form from the Elohistic above-quoted.

(ix) *v.*13, 'Nebaioth,' xxv.13,xxviii.9,xxxvi.3—*nowhere else in the Bible*, except 1Ch.i.29, (where it is plainly copied from the passage before us,) and Is.lx.7.

*(x) *v.*16, 'twelve princes'; *comp.* 'twelve princes shall he beget,' xvii.20.

*(xi) *v.*17, 'and these are the years of the life of Ishmael,' (139.iii).

*(xii) *v.*17, מֵאָה, 'hundred,' (10.ix).

*(xiii) *v.*17, 'and he expired and died, and was gathered unto his people,' (147.iv).

*(xiv) *v.*17, גָּוַע, 'expire,' (19.xi).

## 153. xxv.18, *Jehovist.*

*(i) שָׁכַן, 'abide,' (4.xxvii).

*(ii) 'and they abode from Havilah unto Shur, . . . at thy going to Asshur,' (50.x).

*(iii) 'Havilah,' ii.11, x.7,29, xxv.18—*nowhere else in the Pentateuch.*

(iv) 'Shur,' as in xvi.7,—also $E_2$ (xx.1)—*nowhere else in Genesis.*
*(v) 'at thy going to Asshur,' (50.ix).
*(vi) 'eastward of all his brethren he fell,' (58.i).

154. Having now given (152) good reasons, as we believe, for assigning wholly to E the account of Ishmael's offspring in *v.*12-16, the view, which we feel obliged to take of this section, will necessarily affect our judgment with respect to the other similar genealogical lists in xxxv.22$^{b}$–26,xxxvi.9-43,xlvi.8–27, which are the only passages of any importance, in respect of which our conclusions differ materially from those of HUPFELD. *All* of these passages we ascribe to the Elohist; whereas HUPFELD and BOEHMER assign them *all* to the Jehovist, in accordance with the observation of KUENEN, (note [95], *Eng.Trans.*)—

TUCH, STÄHELIN, DELITZSCH, and KNOBEL, ascribe these genealogies to the Elohistic document . . . And, in fact, it is very natural that they should be ascribed either *wholly* to the Elohist or *not at all.*

155. It should be noted, however, that there is an essential distinction between the nature of these lists, which we ascribe to the Elohist, and the Jehovistic genealogies in xxii.20–24, xxv.1–4. The Jehovist is not concerned with the *direct line* of Abraham, but only with *collateral branches* of his family, who are honoured by being brought into any connection with his history. The Elohist refers to certain supposed off-shoots of Abraham, but not standing in any connection with the promises, which, according to him, were expressly limited to Isaac and Ishmael, xvii.20,21. There is a reason then why this writer should give some special notice of the sons of Ishmael, xxv.12–16, and of Esau, xxxvi, as well as of those of Isaac and Jacob. And as to Ishmael, we have, as already observed, every ground to expect that his narrative would contain somewhere an account of the numerous progeny of Ishmael,—his 'twelve princes according to their folks,'—when we observe the emphasis with which the promise to him is enounced in xvii.20:—

'As for Ishmael, I have heard thee; behold! I have blessed him and fructified

him and multiplied him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget, and I will give him for a great nation.'

156. But then, if xxv.12–16 belongs to E, it is probable *à priori* that the other similar lists belong also to this writer. And, indeed, these also might have been expected from the fact that the Elohist lays such great stress upon the *multiplication* of Abraham's progeny, and of the 'multitude of *nations*,' the 'company of *peoples*,' that should spring from him (95.xii), whereas Israel was but *one* nation. Since, therefore, he dwells continually on this point, *viz.* that Abraham should be 'the father of a multitude of nations,' it seems, we repeat, most reasonable to expect that somewhere in his story he should have given evidence that the promise in question was actually fulfilled, by specifying the different peoples which he regarded as descended from Abraham, through Ishmael as well as Isaac, through Esau as well as Jacob. And this we believe him to have done in these very lists, which contain also, independently, as our analysis will show, strong indications of their Elohistic origin.

157. xxv.19,20, *Elohist.*

*(i) *v.*19, 'and these are the generations of Isaac, the son of Abraham'; *comp.* xxv.12, and see (2.iii).

*(ii) *v.*19, הוֹלִיד, 'beget,' (10.viii).

(iii) *v.*20, 'date of Isaac's marriage,' (10.vii).

(iv) *v.*20, 'Rebekah, daughter of Bethuel the Aramæan, sister of Laban the Aramæan';

*comp.* 'go to Padan-Aram, to the house of Bethuel thy mother's brother, and take to thee from thence a wife out of the daughters of Laban thy mother's brother,' xxviii.2;

'he went to Padan-Aram, unto Laban the son of Bethuel the Aramæan, Rebekah's brother,' xxviii.5.

N.B. This particularity of definition implies that the writer knows nothing of the Jehovistic chapter, xxiv, where Rebekah and her relatives are so fully described.

(v) *v.*20, 'Padan-Aram,' xxv.20, xxviii.2,5,6,7, xxxi.18, xxxv.9,26, xlvi.15, 'Padan,' xlviii.7: but J has 'Padan-Aram,' xxxiii.18, and 'Aram-Naharaim,' xxiv.10.

158. xxv.21$^{b}$,24–26.

HUPFELD gives to E *v.*26$^{b}$ and, perhaps, *v.*21$^{b}$, and says, *p.*31:

Thus there is wanting [in E] only the account of the birth of the sons and their names, which could not be retained together with the more precise formulæ and details of the Jehovist,—*the first small omission this* in the primary document.

BOEHMER writes, p.85 :—

*v.*21$^{b}$, which HUPFELD assigns to E, I have given to the Jehovist, since *v.*15 [*sic*, but ? *v.*24, which follows *v.*21$^{b}$ in BOEHMER's J. document,] requires such a commencement; and, at all events, by means of this the narrative of this author becomes here free from any hiatus.

Certainly *v.*21$^{b}$ might be assigned either to E or to J, since similar formulæ to this, 'and Rebekah his wife conceived,' are employed by both writers. But I agree with HUPFELD in assigning it here to E, to whom also I give—not *v.*26$^{b}$ only, with HUPFELD, but—*v.*24–26, for the reasons given below.

159. xxv.21$^{b}$,24–26, *Elohist.*

(i) *v.*26$^{b}$ undoubtedly belongs to E, as both HUPFELD and BOEHMER allow :—

($\alpha$) date of the birth of Esau and Jacob, (10.vii);

($\beta$) 'sixty years' stands in connection with the 'forty years' of *v.*20;

($\gamma$) 'and Isaac was a son of 60 years at her bearing them';

*comp.* 'and Abraham was a son of 86 years at Hagar's bearing Ishmael,' xvi.16; *comp.* also xii,4$^{b}$, xvii.24,25, xxi.5; but J has also a like formula in xli.46.

(ii) But *v.*26$^{b}$, by the expression 'at her bearing *them*,' implies that the writer has been speaking about the birth of *twins*, as in *v.*24$^{b}$.

(iii) So, too, in *v.*26$^{b}$, בְּלֶדֶת, 'at the bearing,' seems to refer to לָלֶדֶת, 'for the bearing,' in *v.*24$^{a}$.

(iv) Thus *v.*26$^{b}$ seems to point to *v.*24 as also due to the same writer.

(v) But if *v.*24 belongs to E, then certainly so also does *v.*25.26$^{a}$, where we have *allusions*, without any formal derivation, to the names 'Edom,' 'Seir,' 'Esau,' 'Jacob,' just like those to the names 'Abraham,' 'Sarah,' 'Ishmael,' and 'Isaac,' already noted in (95.xiii,xxix,xxx,xxxvi) *viz.* :—

'Edom' (אֱדֹם) from אַדְמוֹנִי, 'red'—'the first came-out *red*,' *v.*25;

'Seir' (שֵׂעִיר) from שֵׂעָר, 'hairy'—'like a garment of *hair*,' *v.*25;

'Esau' (עֵשָׂו) from שֵׂעָר, *comp.* עשׂ and שׂע; (but this is more doubtful;)

'Jacob' (יַעֲקֹב) = 'he supplants,' from עָקֵב, 'heel,'—'his hand grasped Esau's *heel*,' *v.*26$^{a}$.

(vi) The fact that E *has* played upon the names of 'Abraham,' 'Sarah,' 'Ishmael,' and 'Isaac,' makes it the *more* probable that he has also played upon those of 'Edom' and 'Jacob.'

(vii) On the other hand, the fact that J derives formally the name 'Edom' in *v.*30, (as he plays upon 'Jacob' in xxvii.36,) makes it the *less* probable that he has here in *v.*25 given *another* derivation of Edom; and, if *v.*25 is not his, then certainly neither is *v.*26$^{a}$.

(viii) *v.*25, 'and *they* called his name': this *plural impersonal* form of קָרָא 'call,' is not used by the Jehovist, nor, indeed, anywhere else in the whole Bible; though J so frequently makes use of the *singular* impersonal form, active or passive, in the derivation of names, ii.23, xi.9, xvi.14, xix.22, xxv.30, xxvi.33, xxix.34, xxxi.48, xxxiii.17. This makes it *unlikely* that he has here made a solitary exception to his universal rule in *such* cases. But a similar *plur. impers.* form with another verb is used *twice* by E in xlix.31, 'there *they* buried Abraham and Sarah; there *they* buried Isaac and Rebekah,' and also by J in xxvi.18, xxix.2,3,8.

(ix) *v.*26ᵃ, 'and (he=) one called his name Jacob,' *comp.* xxxv.10, xxx.8ᶜ,11,13, 18ᶜ,20ᶜ,21,24ᵃ, all which we ascribe to E, as HUPFELD and BOEHMER do xxxv.10.

N.B. This *singular* impersonal form is used by the Jehovist *without* אֶת, as here, in xxxviii.29,30, and *with* it in xxxviii.3. But his favourite formula is 'therefore (עַל־כֵּן) he called &c.,' which he uses *eleven* times (55.xii). It seems unlikely, even supposing that he wrote *v.*25,26ᵃ,—and therefore did not use this favourite formula in *either* of these two instances, though it ran so freely from his pen, and, accordingly, he *does* use it in *v.*30,—that in *v.*25 he should have used instead of it an altogether strange and unusual form, which occurs nowhere else in the Pentateuch, though it is used in Ju.ii.5, xviii.29. But, if *one* of these derivations belongs not to J, then neither does the other.

(x) *v.*26ᵃ, אַחֲרֵי־כֵן, 'afterwards,' xxiii.19,—also J(xxxii.20(21),xlv.15), D(vi.4, xv.14).

(xi) *v.*26ᵃ, אָחַז, 'grasp,' as in J(xxii.13), *comp.* also J(xxxiv.10, xlvii.27ᵃ); but E uses repeatedly אֲחֻזָּה, 'possession,' (95.xxiii).

(xii) *v.*21ᵇ belongs evidently to the same connection as *v.*24.

(xiii) *v.*21ᵇ, 'and Rebekah his wife conceived';

*comp.* 'and Sarah conceived,' xxi.2, where E is beginning to relate the birth of Isaac, as he is here beginning to relate that of Esau and Jacob.

(xiv) *v.*21ᵇ, 'Rebekah his wife,' *comp.* 'Sarah his wife,' *v.*10.

(xv) Lastly, the expression of the *Jehovist* in *v.*22, 'and *the children* struggled within her,' anticipates *v.*24, 'behold there were twins in her womb!' and shows that the writer has inadvertently assumed beforehand the fact of their being twins in her womb, from having it (as we suppose) before him in E.

160. HUPFELD, however, *p.*31, states the following objections to assigning *v.*24–26ᵃ to E:—

(1) the Jehovistic derivation of names;

(2) *v.*24ᵃ, 'and her *days were fulfilled* to bear';
*comp.* 'my *days are fulfilled*,' xxix.21(J);
'forty *days were fulfilled* for him, for so are *fulfilled the days* of the embalming,' l.3(J).

(3) the general resemblance to the story of Tamar, xxxviii.27,28,29(J);

(4) the identity of expression between *v.*24ᵇ, 'behold twins in her womb!' with xxxviii.27(J).

*Ans.* (1) The Elohist also alludes to the derivation of names (159.v,vi).

(2) This formula is not very characteristic, and taken by itself cannot decide the question. It might very well have been used by E when the occasion, as here, required it. In fact, besides the above three passages, it occurs in the whole Bible in the following, E.vii.25, L.viii.33, xii.4,6, N.vi.5,13, *comp.* G.xxix.27,28, E.xxiii.26, L.xxv.30, Is.lxv.20; and of these passages several are ascribed by STÄHELIN, DE WETTE, VATKE, KNOBEL, EWALD, to E, as KUENEN observes (note [101], *Eng. Ed.*), although he justly adds, 'No *proofs*, in the strict sense of the word, are produced for these positions,' and we cannot therefore assign them *all* to E, without further examination. With respect to one of them, however, L.xxv.30, we may observe that it contains the use of לְ קוּם, 'stand to' = be assured to, as in G.xxiii.17, 20, &c., and 'after his generations' (19.ii); in the context also we have אֲחֻזָּה, 'possession,' *thirteen* times, *v.*10,13,24, &c. (95.xxiii), and in *v.*24 'land of your possession' as in G.xxxvi.43, which we assign to E; so that we have here very strong signs of E. We may believe, therefore, that this formula, though used by the Jehovist, might also have been used by the Elohist, as here.

(3) The story of Tamar in xxxviii may, according to *our* view, have been *imitated* from this, which lay before the Jehovistic writer; though this will not accord with the idea of the Jehovist having written independently. But, indeed, it seems to us more improbable that *one and the same* writer should have displayed such poverty of imagination, as to have *twice* adapted the very same incident to two different stories, than that the Jehovist in xxxviii should have imitated the earlier writer of xxv.24–26, as he seems to have repeatedly imitated both E and $E_2$ in other parts of Genesis; *comp.* xii.14–20(J) with xx.1–17($E_2$),—xxvi.26–33(J) with xxi.22–27[a],32($E_2$),—xxvi.6–11(J) with xx.1–17($E_2$),—xxviii.13–17,19(J) with xxxv.11–15(E),—xxxii.24–28(J) with xxxv.9,10(E).

(4) The expression 'behold twins in her womb!' occurs nowhere else in the Bible; it can scarcely therefore be called Jehovistic from its being used once only by J,—more especially as, in writing xxxviii.27, he may have had before him the E. story in xxv.24–26, and may have imitated its expressions. But, in fact, the J. parallel in xxxviii.27 is *not* the exact counterpart of this: thus we have in xxv.24, 'and *her days were fulfilled to bear*, and behold twins in her womb!' and in xxxviii.27, 'and *it came to pass at the time of her bearing*, and behold twins in her womb!' And, as we have said, the language of *v.*26[b], 'at her bearing *them*,' which HUPFELD himself assigns to E, seems to imply that E had also been speaking of Rebekah 'bearing *twins*'; and, if so, the most simple and natural way of stating this fact would have been to make use of the expression in question.

N.B. BOEHMER, *p.*214, in order to secure the completeness of the three independent narratives, assumes that the Compiler, preferring the account of the births in (J), because of the etymologies, has left out those in (E) and ($E_2$).

## 161. xxv. 21[a],22,23, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*21[a], לְנֹכַח, 'over-against,' as in xxx.38.

(ii) *v.*21[a], 'she was barren';

*comp.* 'and Sarai was barren,' xi.30;

'and Rachel was barren,' xxix.31.

(iii) *v.*21ᵃ, 'was entreated *to* him,' לְ with the passive verb;
*comp.* 'are we not reckoned *to* him,' xxxi.15.
*(iv) *v.*22, בְּקֶרֶב, 'in the midst of,' (97.xxi).
*(v) *v.*22, לָמָּה־זֶּה, 'wherefore this?' xxv.22,32, xxxii.29(30), xxxiii.15;
*comp.* מַה־זֹּאת, xxvi.10, מַה־זֶּה, xxvii.20, 'what is this?'
(vi) *v.*23,23,23, לְאֹם, 'folk,' as in xvii.29.
*(vii) *v.*23, הִפָּרֵד, 'be separated,' (3.x).
*(viii) *v.*23, רַב, 'elder,' צָעִיר, 'younger,' (47.viii).

N.B. The phrase 'enquire of Jehovah,' *v.*22, occurs nowhere else in the Pentateuch, except in D.iv.29, xii.5; but *comp.* 'enquire of Elohim,' E.xviii.15.

The phrase, 'entreat Jehovah,' *v.*21, occurs nowhere else in the Pentateuch, except in E.viii.8,9,28,29,30, x.17,18,—which indicates that this passage is *not* from the *Deuteronomist.* Also the word used in *v.*21ᵃ, הֶעְתֵּר, 'entreat,' is different from that used by $E_2$ in xx.7,17, *viz.* הִתְפַּלֵּל, 'intercede,' to which passage BOEHMER refers, *p.*112,as similar to this, and indicating that this also belongs to $E_2$.

The violent struggling of the children in the womb, predicting the future struggles of Edom and Israel, and the statement that 'one folk shall serve the other,' are quite after the manner of the Jehovist, who predicts that the Cainites shall be wandering nomads, iv.12,14, that Canaan shall be a servant of servants to his brethren, ix.25,26,27, and that Ishmael shall be a 'wild-man, living eastward of his brethren, whose hand should be against every man, and every man's hand against him,' xvi.12, and to whom, indeed, belong *all* the poetical passages, such as this, in Genesis, *e.g.* ix.25–27, xxv.23, xxvii.27–29,39,40, xlviii.15,16,19, xlix.2–27.

## 162. xxv.27–34, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*27, 'and the youths grew'; *comp.* 'and the man grew,' xxvi.13,—also $E_2$(xxi.8,20).
(ii) *v.*27, 'Esau was a man knowing hunting,' prepares for the story in xxvii.
(iii) *v.*27, 'a man of the field'; *comp.* 'a man of the ground,' ix.20.
(iv) *v.*27, 'dwelling in tents,' as in iv.20.
(v) *v.*28, 'Isaac loved Esau, for game was in his mouth,' and 'Rebekah loved Jacob,' prepares for xxvii; *comp.* 'dish, such as I love (he loveth),' xxvii.4,9.
*(vi) *v.*28, 'Isaac loved Esau,' 'Rebekah loved Jacob';
*comp.* 'Jacob loved Rachel,' xxix.18, 'Israel loved Joseph,' xxxvii.3.
*(vii) *v* 30, 'therefore (עַל־כֵּן) he (one) called his name Edom,' derivation of the name Edom (אֱדֹם) from אָדֹם, '*red* (pottage),' as in (55.xii).
*(viii) *v.*31,33, כַּיּוֹם, 'as at this day'; *comp.* l.20.
*(ix) *v.*32, 'going to die'; *comp.* 'going to take-down,' xxxvii.25.
*(x) *v.*32, לָמָּה־זֶּה, 'wherefore this,' (161.v).
(xi) *v.*32, 'for what is this my birthright to me?',
*comp.* 'for what is my life to me?' xxvii.46.
(xii) *v.*33,33, 'swear,' (126.x).
(xiii) *v.*34, קוּם, 'arise' = start, (63.xxv).

## 163. xxvi.1–3, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*1, 'and there was a famine in the land,' as in xii.10.

*(ii) *v.*1, לְבַד, 'apart,' (3.xiii).

(iii) *v.*1, 'apart from the first famine which was in the days of Abraham,' refers evidently to xii.10–20.

(iv) *v.*1, 'Abimelech,' 'Gerar,'—these names adopted probably, as the whole story seems to be imitated, from xx.1–17($E_2$).

(v) *v.*2, 'and Jehovah appeared unto him,' as in xviii.1 (59.vi).

*(vi) *v.*2, שָׁכַן, 'abide,' (4.xxvii).

*(vii) *v.*2, 'the land which I will (say unto thee) = tell thee of';

*comp.* 'the land which I will (make thee to see =) show thee,' xii.1;

'one of the mountains which I will tell thee of,' xxii.2;

*comp.* also 'whom I will (say) speak unto,' xxiv.14;

'whom ye (said) spake of,' xliii.27;

'whom ye (said) spake of unto me,' xliii.29.

(viii) *v.*3, 'sojourn in this land'; *comp.* in the counterpart story, 'and he went down to Egypt to sojourn there,' xii.10.

(ix) *v.*3, 'this land,' xii.7, xxiv.5,7, xxvi.3, xxxi.13, and D(xv.7,18).

(x) *v.*3, 'I will be with (עִם) thee,' xxvi.3, xxxi.3;

'I am with (אֵת) thee,' xxvi.24;

'we saw surely that Jehovah was with (עִם) thee,' xxvi.28;

'I am with (עִם) thee,' xxviii.15;

'if Elohim will be with (עִם) me,' xxviii.20;

'the Elohim of my father has been with (עִם) me,' xxxi.5;

'the Elohim of my father . . . . has been with (לְ) me,' xxxi.42;

'the EL who was with (עִם) me in the way which I went,' xxxv.3;

'Jehovah was with (אֵת) Joseph (him),' xxxix.2,21,23;

'and his master saw that Jehovah was with (אֵת) him,' xxxix.3;

'I will go down with (עִם) thee,' xlvi.4;

'Elohim will be with (עִם) thee,' xlviii.21:

$E_2$ has similar formulæ in xxi.20,22.

(xi) *v.*3, 'and I will bless thee,' as in xii.2.

(xii) *v.*3, 'to thee and to thy seed will I give all these lands';

*comp.* 'to thy seed will I give this land,' xii.7, xxiv.7;

'all the land which thou seest to thee will I give it and to thy seed,' xiii.15.

N.B. 'all these lands' may be used with reference to the land of Gerar, as one of the 'lands' of the Canaanites, and corresponds with the language in xiii.14–17, 'look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward, for all the land which thou seest to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever . . . . Arise, go through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it, for I will give it to thee.'

(xiii) *v.*3, 'all lands,' as in xli.54,—also D(xxvi.4); 'lands,' plur., x.5,20,31.

(xiv) *v.*3, הָאֵל, 'these,' as in xix.8,25,—only five times besides in the Bible, *viz.* G.xxvi.4, L.xviii.27, D.iv.42, vii.22, xix.11, *comp.* 1Ch.xx.8.

(xv) *v.*3, 'the oath which I sware to Abraham thy father,' (141.xv.N.B.).

(xvi) *v.*3, 'swear,' (126.x), שְׁבוּעָה, 'oath,' as in xxiv.8.

N.B. The phrase 'establish a *covenant*' is Elohistic (19.xii): but 'establish an *oath*' occurs nowhere else in the Pentateuch. According to our view (141.xv.N.B.), the Jehovist had expressly in his mind the 'covenant' *established* in xvii.7,19,21, which he regarded as equivalent to an *oath*.

## 164. xxvi.4,5, *Deuteronomist.*

In *v.*4 we read:—

'and I have given to thy seed all these lands,'—

which is a manifest repetition of the words in *v.*3, and suggests the possibility of an interpolation; and this suspicion is confirmed, and the insertion shown to be due to D, as follows.

(i) *v.*4, 'and I have multiplied thy seed,' (135.xii).

(ii) *v.*4, 'as the stars of heaven,' (135.xiii).

(iii) *v.*4, 'these lands,' probably copied from *v.*3; but הָאֵל, 'these,' is used thrice by the Deuteronomist, iv.42, vii.22, xix.11, *comp.*(163.xiv).

(iv) *v.*4, 'and by thy seed shall all nations of the earth bless themselves,' (98.iv).

(v) *v.*4, 'all nations of the earth,' (98.iii).

(vi) *v.*5, עֵקֶב אֲשֶׁר, 'because that,' (135.xix).

(vii) *v.*5, 'hearken to the voice of,' (135.xx).

(viii) *v.*5, 'he hearkened to my voice and observed my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws';

*comp.* 'thou shalt hearken to the voice of Jehovah thy God, to observe all His commandments,' D.xiii.18;

'if thou hearken to the voice of Jehovah thy God, to observe to do all these commandments,' D.xv.5, xxviii.1;

'to observe His statutes and His commandments and His judgments, and to hearken unto His voice,' D.xxvi.17;

'if thou hearken not to the voice of Jehovah thy God, to observe to do all His commandments and His statutes,' D.xxviii.15;

'because thou hearkenedst not to the voice of Jehovah thy God, to observe His commandments and His statutes,' D.xxviii.45;

'if thou shalt hearken to the voice of Jehovah thy God, to observe His commandments and His statutes,' D.xxx.10;

*comp.* also D.vi.3, vii.12, xii.28, xxviii.13, xxxi.12, and E.xv.26, xix.5, L.xxvi.14.

(ix) *v.*5, '*keep My charge and My commandments and My statutes* and My laws';

*comp.* '*keep His charge and His statutes* and His judgments *and His commandments*,' D.xi.1.

(x) *v.*4,5, so entirely corresponds with xxii.17,18, that, if one of these passages is due to the Deut. editor, then certainly so is the other.

165. In Deuteronomy, the synonyms 'charge,' 'ordinance,' 'ordinances,' 'statutes,' 'commandments,' 'judgments,' 'testimonies,' occur very frequently, either separately, or combined two, three, or four together, in all possible varieties. Thus, in one single chapter, D.vi, we have 'commandments, statutes, and judgments,' *v.*1, 'commandments, testimonies, and statutes,' *v.*17, 'testimonies, statutes, and judgments,' *v.*20, 'statutes,' *v.*24, 'commandments,' *v.*25; and in the whole Book such expressions are used *fifty-five* times. Similar formulæ occur *twenty-four* times only in the rest of the Pentateuch; and then chiefly, as we believe—if not *entirely*, when synonyms occur *three* together,—in Deuteronomistic interpolations. But in Deuteronomy *only* do they occur *four* together as in the above instance, D.xi.1; and in Deuteronomy they are found *three* together in the following *nine* instances:—

'testimonies, statutes, judgments,' D.iv.45, vi.20,
'commandments, statutes, judgments,' D.v.31, vi.1, vii.11, xxx.16,
'commandments, testimonies, statutes,' D.vi.17,
'commandments, judgments, statutes,' D.viii.11,
'statutes, commandments, judgments,' D.xxvi.17.

The only other examples of this in the Pentateuch occur in L.xxvi, (which we believe to be due to the Deuteronomist,) viz. 'statutes, judgments, commandments,' *v.*15, 'statutes, judgments, laws,' *v.*46.

166. xxvi.6–17, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*7,7, 'the men of the place,' xxvi.7,7, xxix.22, xxxviii.21.

(ii) *v.*7, 'and he said, She is my sister,' as in $E_2$ (xx.2);

*comp.* 'say I pray thee, thou art my sister,' xii.13.

(iii) *v.*7, 'lest they kill me for Rebekah,' as in $E_2$(xx.11), 'they will kill me for the matter of my wife'; *comp.* 'they will kill me,' xii.12.

(iv) *v.*7, 'goodly of form was she,' *comp.* 'fair of form art thou,' xii.11 (59.xvi).

*(v) *v.*8, 'the days were prolonged to him there,' (128.iv);

*comp.* 'he sojourned in the land of the Philistines many days,' xxi.34.

(vi) *v.*8, הִשְׁקִיף, 'look,' as in xviii.16, xix.28.

(vii) *v.*8, בָּעַד, 'behind,' (31.iii).
(viii) *v.*8, חַלּוֹן, 'window,' as in viii.6.
(ix) *v.*9, 'and Abimelech called to Isaac and said,'—$E_2$(xx.9);
*comp.* 'and Pharaoh called to Abram, and said,' xii.18(J).
(x) *v.*9, 'how saidst thou, She is my sister?'
*comp.* 'wherefore saidst thou, She is my sister?' xii.19.
*(xi) *v.*10, מַה־זֹּאת, 'what is this,' (161.v).
(xii) *v.*10, 'what is this thou hast done to us?'—$E_2$(xx.9);
*comp.* 'what is this thou hast done to me?' xii.18 (4.xiii).
(xiii) *v.*10, 'thou hast brought on us transgression';
*comp.* 'thou hast brought on me .... a great sin,' xx.9($E_2$).
(xiv) *v.*11, נָגַע, 'touch,' (4.vi)—$E_2$(xx.6).
(xv) *v.*11, 'he shall surely be put-to-death,' as in ii.17, iii.4—$E_2$(xx.7).
*(xvi) *v.*11, הָמֵת, 'put-to-death,' (97.xl).
(xvii) *v.*12, מֵאָה, 'hundred,' (13.v).
*(xviii) *v.*12, 'and Jehovah blessed him,' (141.iii).
(xix) *v.*13, 'and the man grew,' (162.i).
(xx) *v.*13, 'going and growing,'=growing continually, (38.v.N.B).
*(xxi) *v.*13, עַד־כִּי, 'until,' as in xli.49, xlix.10,—only besides in 2S.xxiii.10;
*comp.* עַד־(אֲשֶׁר־)אִם, xxiv.19,33, xxviii.15.
*(xxii) *v.*14, 'cattle of flocks and cattle of herds,' as in xlvii.17, 2Ch.xxxii.29, Eccles.ii.7.
(xxiii) *v.*14, flocks, herds, servants (59.xxii).
*(xxiv) *v.*14, קִנְאָה, 'be jealous at,' xxvi.14, xxx.1, xxxvii.11.
(xxv) *v.*15, 'his father's servants,' *comp.* 'Isaac's servants,' *v.*19,25,32.
*(xxvi) *v.*16, עָצַם מִן, 'be stronger than,' (5.xviii).
(xxvii) *v.*17, חָנָה, 'encamp,' as in xxxiii.18.

167. In *v.*15 we read,—

'and also *the wells which* his father's servants *dug in the days of Abraham his father, the Philistines stopped them,* and filled them with earth';

and again we read in *v.*18—

'and Isaac returned and dug *the wells* of water, *which* they *dug in the days of Abraham his father,* and *the Philistines had stopped them* after the death of Abraham.'

It seems plain that one and the same writer cannot have written these two almost identical passages in such close juxtaposition, as part of the same context. Besides which J in *v.*15 represents this 'stopping' of the wells as proceeding direct from the 'envy' of the Philistines towards Isaac, *v.*14; whereas in *v.*18 it is mentioned merely as a fact, which had resulted in

consequence of Abraham's death. It seems probable that *v.*18 belongs to $E_2$, who wrote it originally to follow the E. passage xxv.24–26. Then J has afterwards interpolated the passages, xxv.27–34, preparing for xxvii, and xxvi.1–3,6–17, leading on the story to *v.*18; and in *v.*15 he has taken up the words of *v.*18, expanding the impersonal 'they dug' into 'his father's servants dug,' and adding the explanation, 'and filled them with earth,' and has then inserted *v.*16,17, to make the link of connection between his interpolation and the words of $E_2$.

In *v.*17 we read 'and he went from *thence*,' i.e. from the *town* of Gerar, where he 'dwelt,' *v.*6, and where also the king lived, *v.*8—*comp.* also 'men of the place,' *v.*7, the 'window,' *v.*8, and encamped in the 'vale of Gerar,' *i.e.* probably, as DELITZSCH says, *p.*448—

'in the well-watered district through which flows the deep and broad stream now called *Djurf-el-Gerar*.'

168. xxvi.18.

As above observed, this verse could hardly have been written as part of the same context with *v.*15, where the same phrases are identically repeated. We believe that this was the original notice, and that it is due to $E_2$, who merely wished to express by it the fact; that Isaac took possession again of the famous well at Beersheba, which his father had dug, and which the Philistine king Abimelech had allowed him to keep as his own property, xxi.25–27ª,32. The writer here speaks, indeed, of '*wells*, which they dug in the days of Abraham.' But hitherto no one has mentioned any 'wells' dug by Abraham. Only $E_2$, in xxi.25, has mentioned a single well—evidently one of great interest and importance in the writer's view—about which Abraham complained to Abimelech, because the king's servants had 'taken it by force.' It is plain also from xxi.32 that $E_2$ wished to imply that Abraham had called this well by the name 'Beersheba,' though he does not expressly mention that fact. And so, in the

verse before us, he does not mention by what names Isaac called these wells. He says merely—

'he called their names according to the names which his father had called to them,'—

having specially,—if not, indeed, solely—in view in these words, as we suppose, the one particular well at Beersheba.

169. xxvi.18, *Second Elohist.*

(i) 'the Philistines stopped them *after Abraham's death,*' *i.e.* according to the original notice of $E_2$, not out of illwill and envy against Isaac because he had grown so wealthy and powerful, but merely because *Abraham was dead,* to whom Abimelech had left the peaceable possession of the well, according to this writer, xxi.25–27ᵃ,32, against the wishes of his 'servants,' *v.*25. The people, who had acquiesced in the king's decision which secured the well to Abraham during his lifetime, considered that the grant had *lapsed* at his death, and thus may be supposed to have stopped it; but Isaac reasserted his claim and dug it again.

(ii) 'after Abraham's death' seems to repeat the words of E in xxv.11ᵇ; 'and it came to pass that, *after Abraham's death,* Elohim blessed Isaac.'

(iii) 'and he called to them names as the names which his father called to them,' probably, merely means to say that Isaac redug the 'well' at Beersheba which his father had dug, and which he called 'Beersheba' = well of the oath, by the name given to it of old by Abraham—(as $E_2$ *suggests,* xxi.23–25,32, though he does not expressly assert it)—because of the 'oath' which he took to Abimelech. As we have said, this note by $E_2$ seems merely intended to re-establish the right of the Patriarchs to the possession of *Beersheba.*

170. The brief notice of $E_2$ in *v.*18 has been afterwards enlarged by J in *v.*19–25 into a rediscovery and renaming of the well 'Beersheba,' after a solemn covenant and 'oath' between Abimelech and Isaac.

It is probable also that the account of the successive discovery and naming of different 'wells,' *v.*19–22, may have been suggested by the expressions of $E_2$ in *v.*18,—

'Isaac dug again the *wells* . . . . and called their names &c.'

But obviously this account in *v.*19-22 can hardly have formed originally part of the same context with *v.*18.

171. xxvi.19–33, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*19,25,32, 'Isaac's servants,' *comp.* 'his father's servants,' *v.*15.

(ii) *v.*19, 'the vale,' as in *v.*17.

(iii) *v.*20, 'and the shepherds of Gerar strove with the shepherds of Isaac';

*comp.* 'and there was a strife between the shepherds of Abram's cattle and the shepherds of Lot's cattle,' xiii.7;

'let there not be strife between me and thee, and between my shepherds and thy shepherds,' xiii.8.

(iv) *v.*20, 'and he called the name of the well 'Esek' (עֵשֶׂק, 'strife'), *for* they strove (עָשַׂק) with him,'—direct derivation as in (3.xvi).

(v) *v.*21, 'and they strove also about that; and he called its name 'Sitnah' (שִׂטְנָה, 'enmity')—indirect derivation as in (3.iv).

*(vi) *v.*22, עָתַק, 'remove,' as in xii.8—only besides in Job, Ps.vi.7(8), Pr.xxv.1.

*(vii) *v.*22,25, 'and he removed from thence . . . and he built there an altar, and called on the name of Jehovah, and pitched his tent there';

*comp.* 'and he removed from thence . . . and pitched his tent . . . and built there an altar to Jehovah, and called on the name of Jehovah,' xii.8.

*(viii) *v.*22, 'and he called its name 'Rehoboth' (רְחֹבוֹת, 'room,') and said, For now Jehovah hath made room (רָחַב, for us,'—direct derivation, as in (3.xvi).

(ix) *v.*22, 'fruitful in the land,' as in xli.52.

(x) *v.*23, 'and he went-up from thence to Beersheba,' where, according to *this* writer, Abraham formerly dwelt, xxii.19, and where also he makes Isaac to be dwelling, xxviii.10, when he sent Jacob away to Charran.

(xi) *v.*24, 'Jehovah appeared unto him,' (59.vi).

(xii) *v.*24, 'in that night,' *v.*32, 'in that day,' (99.lvi).

*(xiii) *v.*24, 'I am the Elohim of Abraham thy father,' (47.xii).

(xiv) *v.*24, 'fear not,' xxvi.24,xxxv.17,xliii.23,xlvi.3,l.19,21,$E_2$(xxi.17),D(xv.1).

(xv) *v.*24, 'I am with (אֵת) thee,' (163.x).

(xvi) *v.*24, 'I am with thee and have blessed thee';

*comp.* 'I will be with thee and will bless thee,' *v.*3.

(xvii) *v.*24, 'I have multiplied thy seed,' (63.xxiv).

*(xviii) *v.*24, בַּעֲבוּר, 'for the sake of,' (4.xviii).

(xix) *v.*24, 'Abraham My servant,' *comp.* 'Thy servant Isaac,' xxiv.14, 'Thy servant,' xxxii.10.

*(xx) *v.*25, 'and he built there an altar,' *comp.* xxii.9, xxxiii.20, (45.ii).

*(xxi) *v.*25, 'call on the name of Jehovah,' (5.xxx).

*(xxii) *v.*25, 'pitch tent,' (59.ix).

*(xxiii) *v.*25, נָטָה, 'extend,' (59.x).

(xxiv) *v.*25, כָּרָה, 'dig,' as in l.5.

N.B. There is something awkward here in the order of events. As the story now stands, Isaac arrives at Beersheba, *v.*23, *spends the night* there, *v.*24, then builds an altar and worships, *v.*25, and after all this 'pitches his tent,' *v.*25;

*comp.* the different order of events in xii.8, quoted above in (vii).

(xxv) *v.*26, 'Abimelech' and 'Phichol, captain of his host,' as in xxi.22($E_2$).

(xxvi) *v.*26, 'and Abimelech went unto him,' *comp.* 'and Isaac went unto Abimelech,' *v.*1.

(xxvii) *v.*27, 'ye hate me and have put me forth from among you,' refers to *v.*14, 'the Philistines envied him,' and to *v.*16, 'Go from us.'

*(xxviii) *v.*27, שָׂנֵא, 'hate,' (141.lx).

(xxix) *v.*28, 'we have surely seen that Jehovah is with thee';

*comp.* 'Elohim is with thee in all that thou art doing,' xxi.22($E_2$);

and *comp.* the 'oath' and 'covenant' made after the above words in each passage.

(xxx) *v.*28, 'Jehovah was with (עִם) thee,' (163.x).

(xxxi) *v.*28, אָלָה, 'oath,' as in xxiv.41,41, (126.x).

(xxxii) *v.*28, 'cut a covenant,' (126.ii).

(xxxiii) *v.*29, '*if* thou wilt, &c.' = that thou wilt not, &c, xxxi.50,50,52,52,—also $E_2$(xxi.23), $J_3$(xix.23).

*(xxxiv) *v.*29, 'do evil,' (עָשָׂה רָעָה) 'do good,' xxvi.29,xxxi.29,xxxix.9,l.15,17; *comp.* (99.xxi).

(xxxv) *v.*29, 'as we have not *touched* thee,' refers to Abimelech's command, *v.*11, 'he that *toucheth* this man or his wife, shall surely die.'

*(xxxvi) *v.*29, נָגַע, 'touch,' (4.vi).

(xxxvii) *v.*29, 'put thee forth in peace,' refers to Isaac's quiet dismissal in *v.*16.

(xxxviii) *v.*29,31, 'in peace,' as in xxviii.21, *comp.* xliv.17—also D(xv.15).

(xxxix) *v.*29, 'thou now art blessed of Jehovah';

*comp.* 'enter, thou blessed of Jehovah,' xxiv.31.

(xl) *v.*30, 'and he made for them a feast, and they ate, and drank';

*comp.* 'and he made for them a feast, . . . and they ate,' xix.3.

(xli) *v.*31, 'rise early in the morning,' (99.xlix).

(xlii) *v.*31, 'they sware one to another';

*comp.* 'they sware both of them,' xxi.31.

(xliii) *v.*32, 'in that day,' (99.lvi).

(xliv) *v* 32, עַל אֹדוֹת, 'concerning,' as in xxi.11,25($E_2$),—*nowhere else in Genesis.*

(xlv) *v.*33, 'and he called it Shebah (שִׁבְעָה) from שָׁבַע, 'swear,' *v.*31,—indirect derivation, as in (3.iv).

*(xlvi) *v.*33, 'therefore (עַל־כֵּן) the name of the city was Beersheba,' direct derivation, as in (55.xii).

(xlvii) *v.*33, 'unto this day,' (99.lviii).

172. Here the Jehovist has derived the name 'Beersheba' a *second* time, and he has also given the name 'Sheba' to that one of the two wells at Beersheba, to which $E_2$ evidently refers in xxi.32 as giving the name 'Beersheba'='well of the oath' to the *place*, just as here J gives the name 'Sheba' to the well, but 'Beersheba' to the *city*, *v.*33. It is plain that originally the name must have been given to the *well*; but, no doubt, in the time of these writers there was a town of some importance formed at this spot, which had now acquired the name. And this may account for $E_2$ nowhere *naming* the *well* or *wells*, which Abraham dug and Isaac dug again, xxi.25–27,32,xxvi.18.

This, however, is the *third* derivation which the Jehovist suggests for this name, *viz.* (i) 'well of the oath,' because there Abimelech and *Abraham* 'both sware to each other,' xxi.31, (ii) 'well of seven,' because of the seven lambs which Abraham gave Abimelech as a consideration for the well, xxi.28–30, and (iii) 'well of the oath,' because there Abimelech and *Isaac* 'sware one to the other,' xxvi.31.

173. It must seem very strange that the same writer should have repeated here exactly the same transaction as in xxi.31, —with Isaac instead of Abraham, but with identically the same persons, 'Abimelech' and 'Phichol,'—in order to account for the origin of the name 'Beersheba.' It must seem equally strange that we should have *three* very similar accounts of the same not very creditable behaviour, repeated on the part of the patriarchs in respect of their wives, *twice* in the case of Abraham, xii.10,20, xx.1–17, (and the last time when Sarah was, according to the story as it now stands, *ninety* years old, xvii.17(E), and actually pregnant with the heir so ardently desired and so solemnly promised,) and once in that of Isaac, xxvi.6–11.

174. On our view, however, the matter may be explained thus. In the document ($EE_2$) which J had in his hands, containing the original Elohistic narrative with the additions of $E_2$,—(that is, as we suppose, with the additions of J himself at an earlier period of his literary labour,)—stood the passages xx.1–17, xxi.22–27$^a$,32, xxvi.18. The Jehovist may first have merely inserted the verse, xx.18, and filled up xxi.27$^b$–31. Then, on again revising the story at a later day, he may have seen that there was hardly anything said about *Isaac, viz.* only xxv.19,20,24–26, xxvi.18, xxviii.1-5, xxxv.27–29; and he may have thought it best to *cancel* the passages xx.1–18,xxi.22–34 altogether, and write a similar narrative for the *earlier* part of Abraham's life, with the substitution of 'Pharaoh' and 'Egypt' for 'Abimelech' and 'Gerar,'—such a narrative, in fact, as now stands in xii.10–20. He would thus avoid the awkward diffi-

culty as to Sarah's age and condition, and he would have now 'Abimelech' at his disposal for Isaac. Accordingly, he may then have written the passage xxvi.1–3,6–11, which repeats in Isaac's case with Abimelech what had happened *once* before, xii.10–20, in Abraham's case with Pharaoh,—(not *twice*, as it now stands, *viz.* once with Pharaoh, xii.10–20, and once with Abimelech, xx.1–18, since this last was meant to be cancelled,) —employing in this passage, as our analysis shows, expressions common to xii.10–20 and xx. He may then have filled up the story of Isaac with xxvi.12–17,19–25, and added *v.*26–33 to supply the cancelled passage xxi.22–32. Finally, he may have inserted also a passage, xvi.4–14, to explain the name 'Lakhai-roi' which was probably given to one of the two famous wells at 'Beersheba.'

175. Thus the whole may be easily and intelligibly explained. *Why* the passages, which (as we suppose) were meant to have been cancelled, *viz.* xx.1–18,xxi.22–34, have nevertheless been retained, it is easy to imagine. If $E_2$ was a different person from the Jehovist, the latter may have felt unwilling to remove these large portions of the older matter, (even when he had replaced them,) from respect for the other writer, or from a modest hesitation to take so decided a step. Or, if J (as we believe) was the same as $E_2$, he may have merely meant to leave the older matter in its place *for a time* uncancelled, designing to submit the whole to further revision; and so it may have come to be retained in the text altogether. And thus the narrative has come down to us, with all its contradictions and perplexities, including, as we have said, *two* derivations of the name 'Beersheba,' from two transactions almost identically similar,—with identically the same persons, Abimelech and Phichol, on the side of the Philistines, in both cases, but with Abraham in the one narrative, and Isaac in the other, at an interval of nearly a century,—besides a third derivation from the '*seven*' ewe-lambs, xxi.28–30, and including also *three* instances of the same

unworthy conduct on the part of the two patriarchs, repeated twice in the case of Abraham.

176. On the above passage, HUPFELD, from his own point of view, *i.e.* regarding both $E_2$ and J as original independent writers, remarks as follows, *p.*152, &c.

This is the only thing which is told us about Isaac himself and to his honour, whereas the older writers direct attention almost exclusively to his son Jacob. The Jehovist has, therefore, with this passage filled up an almost empty interval in the tradition between Abraham and Jacob, and provides for the promise of Abraham being passed on to the latter through something more than a mere name, through one who really enjoyed the same promise and the Divine Blessing.[1] The contents, however, of this narrative sound almost like an echo and counterpart of that, which has been related by the Second Elohist about Abimelech in xx, xxi. 22,&c.[2] Nay in *v.*15,18,—(*v.*15, stands too early, and is rendered superfluous by *v.*18; which again takes up and carries on the account[3])—the digging-again of the wells, which Abraham had dug and named in that spot, but which had been stopped by the Philistines after his death, seems to refer expressly to xxi.25,&c. Has the author—as it would seem, according to this, and as TUCH assumes, *p.*423, —really had before him that narrative of $E_2$, and by a process of imitation transferred it also to Isaac?

At the commencement, at all events, nothing of this kind appears—rather the contrary. For, inasmuch as he refers to the earlier famine, which compelled Abraham to remove to Egypt, and addresses a Divine direction to Isaac not to do the same, but to 'abide in the land,' he clearly shows that he knew of no other case of this kind but that which he himself had related in xii.[4] But how trite it would be to introduce a second time this double story with the very same persons (Abimelech and his two friends) almost 100 years later, and especially to derive solemnly a second time the very same name![5] The last is altogether inconceivable; rather, we have here a certain sign of this narrative being separate and independent from that, just as we have another similar sign in the second derivation of the names 'Bethel' and 'Israel.'[6]

Further, if we look more closely, we shall see that the supposed reference in *v.*15,18, to xxi.25,&c., is by no means well-founded. For the wells of Abraham, which the Philistines stopped and Isaac dug again, lay in the vale of Gerar, *v.*17, and therefore in the neighbourhood of Gerar, and within the Philistine territory; and this is confirmed by the fact that other wells also, which Isaac dug in the same vale, *v.*19, were contested by the shepherds of Gerar, whereas, when he moves further away, as far as Beersheba, and there finds a well, *v.*22, this contention ceases—(from which facts these wells derived their names). The well, however, which is spoken of in xxi.25,&c., is no other than that about which the compact was made in *v.*28,&c., that is, the well of Beersheba, which is quite different from those contested wells, and at some distance from them, and is also here not the *object* of

the compact—(its discovery, in fact, is only made known to Isaac after the compact)—but only the *scene* of it.[7]

Besides this difference of view in the two accounts, as to the relation in which this well of Beersheba stood to the Philistines, (and as to the origin of the name,) reference is also made in *v.*15,18, to events in the life of Abraham, of which neither $E_2$ in xxi.22,&c., nor J in xxi.33,&c., says anything, and which must be silently included in the general datum of the Jehovist, xxi.34, as to the long sojourn of Abraham 'in the land of the Philistines'; for there seems no sufficient ground for assuming any mutilation by the Compiler.[8] We should have here then a case of an accidental citation of something which had previously happened, and had been passed over in its proper place in the story; and this shows the possibility of other similar cases existing, so that a later reference to a fact does not necessarily presuppose that it has been previously narrated.

177. To the above we reply as follows.

[1] No doubt, the Jehovist had to some extent filled up this gap. He felt that Isaac was a mere shadow—a name, and nothing else—as the story stood, when it came into his hands from those of E, with the mere note of $E_2$ in xxvi.18; and he desired to supply some incidents to give to Isaac also a definite place in the history. But the question is, did he receive the accounts in xxvi and xxvii by *tradition*, or did he merely exercise his own imagination in the way which we have supposed, by imitation and modification of the narrative of $E_2$ in the case of Abraham, (which was perhaps, as we suppose, written in former days by the Jehovist himself,) with the intention (most probably) of cancelling the latter?

[2] The contents of xxvi not only *echo* the incidents of the narrative of $E_2$, but, as our analysis has shown, repeat its very phraseology, as well as the phrases of the Jehovist himself in xii.10–20.

[3] This strange repetition, which HUPFELD takes no further account of, is to us a convincing proof that two different accounts are here mingled.

[4] On our view, the Jehovist meant to cancel xx, and, therefore, *did* intend to know of only one previous narrative of this kind, *viz.* that which he had himself written in xii.10–20.

[5] All this difficulty is removed—as well as that which in any case attends the introduction of Abimelech and Phichol in both stories—by our supposition, that the Jehovist meant to substitute his own narratives in xii and xxvi for those of $E_2$ in xx and xxi, in order to enliven the history of Isaac with some additional incidents.

[6] It is possible, see Text (294), that the Jehovist meant also to suppress the Elohistic account of the giving of the names 'Bethel' and 'Israel.'

[7] Clearly, the well meant in xxvi.25,32,—the well dug at Beersheba, which was called Shebah—*is* the very same well, about which the compact is made in xxi. 28–31, and which lay on the *confines* of Gerar, *within* the Philistine territory, though not in the inhabited part about Gerar, which is more properly called 'the land of the Philistines,' (130). The well 'Rehoboth' is apparently meant to have been dug in the vale of Gerar, like 'Esek' and 'Sitnah:' but, being farther

removed from the inhabited part about the 'place' or town of Gerar, the Philistines did not interfere about it. And so it was, as we suppose, *à fortiori*, with respect to that at Beersheba, which was yet farther removed, though still within their territory. Of course, there exists this difference in the two accounts, that in xxi.32 ($E_2$) Abimelech and Abraham make a covenant *after* Abraham knew of the discovery of the well, xxi.25,32, whereas in xxvi.31(J) Abimelech and Isaac make a covenant *before* Isaac is told of the discovery of the well. But then it only follows that J has not exactly *copied*, but only *imitated* the story as it stood in $E_2$.

(8) The only passage, to which this remark refers, is the statement that Isaac 'dug again the wells, *which they dug in the days of his father*'; and such a fact as this might certainly have been assumed by any writer, without any necessity for its having been formally mentioned in the foregoing narrative. But, in point of fact, as we have said (168), it is very probable that, though he speaks of 'wells,' $E_2$ in *v.*18 is really only referring to *one* single well—that notable one at Beersheba, about which he had written in xxi.25,—or, perhaps, to the *two* wells at Beersheba.

178. Upon the whole, HUPFELD, *p.*151,&c., assigns the entire section, *v.*1–33, to the Jehovist, as we also do, except that we give *v.*4,5, to D, and *v.*18 to $E_2$. BOEHMER gives *v.*6,13,16,17, 19–23,25–33[a], to $E_2$, and *v.*1–5,7–12,14,15,18,24,33[b], to the Compiler, which agrees with ours on one point where we differ from HUPFELD, *viz.* in giving *v.*4,5, to the later Compiler.

But we cannot assent to BOEHMER's view generally, which is much influenced by his original—as it seems to us, certainly erroneous—assignment of iv to D, and xiv,xv, to $E_2$,—an error which has materially affected all his subsequent conclusions.

179. xxvi.34,35, *Elohist.*

This verse is referred to in subsequent Elohistic passages, xxvii.46,xxviii.8,9.

(i) 'and Esau was a son of forty years and he took as wife Judith, daughter of Beeri the Hittite';

*comp.* 'and Isaac was a son of forty years at his taking Rebekah daughter of Bethuel the Aramæan . . . to wife,' xxv.20.

(ii) date of Esau's marriage (10.vii).

180. xxvii.1–46, *Jehovist.*

*(i) *v.*1, 'his elder son,' *v.*15,42, 'her elder son,' 'her younger son,' (47.viii).

*(ii) *v.*2, הִנֵּה־נָא, 'behold I pray,' (59.xv).

(iii) *v.*3, 'go to the field and hunt,' *v.*5, 'Esau went to the field to hunt venison,' refers to xxv.27, 'Esau was a man knowing hunting, a man of the field.'

(iv) *v.*4, 'make me a dainty-dish such as I love,' *v.*9, 'such as he loveth,' *v.*14, such as his father loved';

*comp.* 'Isaac loved Esau, for his venison was in his mouth,' xxv.28.

*(v) *v.*4,10,19,31, בַּעֲבוּר, 'for the sake of,' (4.xviii).

*(vi) *v.*4,33, טֶרֶם, 'not yet,' (3.ii).

(vii) *v.*4,25, 'my soul,' *v.*19,31, 'thy soul,' (59.xxi).

(viii) *v.*5, '*his* son,' *v.*6, '*her* son';

*comp.* 'and Isaac loved Esau . . . and Rebekah loved Jacob,' xxv.28.

(ix) *v.*8, &c. 'hearken to the voice of,' xxvii.8,13,43, xxx.6$^{b}$,—also $E_2$(xxi.12), D(xxii.18,xxvi.5).

(x) *v.*11, 'Esau my brother is a man of hair,' refers to xxv.25(E), which the Jehovist, as we suppose, had before him and was supplementing.

*(xi) *v.*12, אוּלַי, 'perhaps,' (86.ii).

(xii) *v.*13, קְלָלָה, 'curse,' only besides in the Pentateuch in Deuteronomy (*ten* times); but *comp.* קָלַל, 'make light = curse,' viii.21, xii.3, קָלַל, 'be light,' viii.8,11, xvi.4,5, and the 'curses' (4.xiv).

(xiii) *v.*13, 'upon me thy curse!' *comp.* 'upon thee my wrong!' xvi.5.

(xiv) *v.*15, חֲמוּדוֹת, 'desires,' *comp.* חֶמֶד, 'desire,' ii.9, iii.6.

(xv) *v.*15,27, בֶּגֶד, 'garment,' (141.lviii).

(xvi) *v.*18,32, 'who art thou?' *comp.* 'who are those?' xxxiii.5.

*(xvii) *v.*20, מַה־זֶּה, 'what is this?' (161.v).

*(xviii) *v.*20, 'hasten to find,' (141.xxxiv).

*(xix) *v.*20, הִקְרָה, 'make-to-meet,' (141.xxii).

*(xx) *v.*20, 'Jehovah thy Elohim,' (47.xii).

*(xxi) *v.*21, אִם־לֹא, 'if not,' (97.xxx).

*(xxii) *v.*21,22,25,25,26,27, נָגַשׁ, 'come-near,' (97.xxxii).

*(xxiii) *v.*23, הִכִּיר, 'discern,' xxvii.23, xxxi.32, xxxvii.32,33, xxxviii.25,26, xlii.7,7,8,8.

(xxiv) *v.*25, לְמַעַן, 'in order to,' (59.xviii).

*(xxv) *v.*26, 'come-near, I pray, and kiss me,' *v.*27, 'and he came-near and kissed him';

*comp.* 'and Jacob kissed Rachel,' xxix.11;
'and he kissed him,' xxix.13, xxxiii.4, l.1;
'to kiss my daughters and my sons,' xxxi.28;
'and he kissed his daughters,' xxxi.55;
'at thy mouth shall all my people kiss,' xli.40.
'and he kissed all his brethren,' xlv.15.

(xxvi) *v.*27, 'and he smelt the smell,' as in viii.21.

*(xxvii) *v.*27, רְאֵה, 'see,' in the sense of 'behold!' (63.xxi).

(xxviii) *v.*28, הָאֱלֹהִים, Elohim, (133.ii).

(xxix) *v.*29, לְאֻמִּים, 'folk,' as in xxv.23,23,23.

(xxx) *v.*29,37, גְּבִיר, 'lord,' *comp.* גְּבֶרֶת, 'mistress,' xvi.4,8,9.

(xxxi) *v.*29, 'thy mother's sons shall bow down to thee';

*comp.* 'thy father's sons shall bow down to thee,' xlix.8.

(xxxii) *v.*29 'those cursing thee be cursed, and those blessing thee be blessed!'

*comp.* 'I will bless those blessing thee, and him cursing thee will I curse,' xii.3.

*(xxxiii) *v.*30, 'and it came-to-pass as Isaac had finished to bless Jacob,' (97.xlvii).

*(xxxiv) *v.*34, 'at Esau's hearing,' (141.xlvi).

*(xxxv) *v.*34, 'cry (צָעָק) a cry,' (97.xxvii).

(xxxvi) *v.*36, 'my birthright (בְּכֹרָתִי) he took, and behold! now he has taken my blessing (בִּרְכָתִי)'—alliteration, as in (5.xvii).

(xxxvii) *v.*36, indirect derivation of the name 'Jacob,' (3.iv), with nearly the same formula as in (55.xii), but with the *question* הֲכִי, 'is it not true that?' in place of the *assertion* עַל־כֵּן, 'therefore.'

(xxxviii) *v.*36, 'these two-times,' (3.xv).

(xxxix) *v.*36, 'he took my birthright,' refers to xxv.33.

(xl) *v.*38, 'lift-up the voice and weep,' as in xxix.11, *comp.* xxxix.14,15,18, xlv.2, —also $E_2$(xxi.16).

(xli) *v.*28, בָּכָה, 'weep,' xxvii.38, xxix.11, xxxiii.4, xxxvii.35, xlii.24, xliii.30,30, xlv.14,14,15, xlvi.29, l.1,3,17,—also $E_2$(xxi.16).

(xlii) *v.*39, מוֹשָׁב, 'dwelling,' as in x.30.

*(xliii) *v.*40, חֶרֶב, 'sword,' (4.xxvi).

(xliv) *v.*41, שָׂטַם, 'hate,' as in xlix.23, l.15.

(xlv) *v.*41, 'said in his heart,' (45.v).

*(xlvi) *v.*42, 'and it was told to Rebekah,' (137.ii).

(xlvii) *v.*42, 'send and call,' xxvii.42, xxxi.4, xli.8,14; *comp.* 'send and take,' xxvii.45, xlii.16, $E_2$(xx.2).

*(xlviii) *v.*42, נָחַם, 'comfort,' (11.ii).

(xlix) *v.*43, קוּם, 'arise' = start, (63.xxv).

(l) *v.*43, בְּרַח־לְךָ, 'flee thee,' *comp.* (133.v).

*(li) *v.*43, בָּרַח, 'flee,' (86.ix).

(lii) *v.*44, 'some days,' as in xxix.20.

(liii) *v.*46, 'I am weary of my life,' 'for what is my life to me?' *comp.* Rachel's passionate exclamation, 'Give me children, or else I die!' xxx.1.

(liv) *v.*46, 'daughters of the land,' as in xxxiv.1.

(lv) *v.*46, 'for what is my life to me';

*comp.* 'for what is this my birthright to me,' xxv.32.

N.B. *v.*46 is plainly a connecting link to fasten the preceding J. story to the E. in xxviii.1–9, and is written quite in the vivid style of the Jehovist.

181. HUPFELD agrees with us in giving this chapter wholly to the Jehovist; as also does BOEHMER, except that, having assigned xxv.29–34 to the Compiler, he is obliged to ascribe to him *v.*36$^b$, and he gives to the Compiler also *v.*46.

On *v.*36$^{b}$ he writes as follows, *p.*219 :—

'And he (Esau) said, Have they not rightly named his name Jacob (he holds the heel, = supplants)? And so has he held my heel *twice*!'—*i.e.* first at the birth, and again in taking away the paternal blessing. So meant the original (Jehovistic) author. The Compiler, however, wishes to introduce a reference to the story inserted by himself in xxv.29–34, about the earlier purchase of the birthright, and so adds here, 'My birthright he took, and behold! now he has taken my blessing!'

*Ans.* According to our view, xxv.26, where Jacob takes hold of Esau's heel, belongs most probably to E, and xxv.29–34 *certainly* to J, who refers in xxvii.36 to the two crafty acts of Jacob, in buying the birthright from him when he was exhausted and ready to die, and in taking deceitfully his father's blessing.

On *v.*46 he observes :—

This verse exhibits a somewhat different view from xxvi.35, where we read, 'and they (the Hittite wives) were bitterness of spirit to *Isaac* and *Rebekah*.' Thus it is *there* said that both the father and mother of Esau were dissatisfied with the choice which their son had made. '*Here*, however, it appears as if Rebekah was now for the first time wishing to draw Isaac into the same state of dissatisfaction as herself. It looks as if it was through *her* that Isaac sent Jacob to Charran in order to get a wife from thence. The Compiler, however, needed this transition, in order to connect xxvii with xxviii. That chapter, in which we find recorded the deceit prompted by Rebekah, closes with her advice to Jacob to flee to Charran from the wrath of his brother. This is the Jehovist's statement. Then follows the account of E, according to which Isaac himself sends Jacob to Laban to get a wife there. The most obvious connecting link, which the Compiler could supply, was just this, to give such a colouring to the matter by means of an interpolated verse, that Isaac should seem to have done this at the instigation of Rebekah, who wished to get Jacob away for his own safety. The phrase 'daughters of the land' recurs again with the *Compiler* in xxxiv.1.

*Ans.* According to our view, xxxiv.1 belongs also to the Jehovist, as does also certainly, as it seems to us, the verse before us.

182. It is generally supposed that when Jacob played this trick on Esau, they were both *young men*, and at any rate, as the story now stands, that they could not have been much older than *forty*, since Esau married at that age, xxvi.34, and his marriage was the immediate cause of Jacob's being sent to Padan-Aram to get a wife, xxviii.1–9. For it can hardly have been meant to say that Isaac and Rebekah endured such 'bitterness of spirit' and 'weariness of life' on account of Esau's Hittite wives, as is described in xxvi.34, xxvii.46, for *nearly*

*forty years*, before any measures were taken to prevent Jacob taking 'a wife of the daughters of Canaan.'

183. Yet this is actually the case, as the story now stands, though there is no incongruity in the old Elohistic narrative. Esau married at forty, as Isaac his father had done before him, xxv.20, and as probably Jacob also was supposed to have done, shortly after he was sent to Padan-Aram—*i.e.* immediately after his brother's disagreeable marriage. The Elohist, as we shall see, knew nothing about the twenty years' *servitude* in Charran. But he supposes Jacob to have married, and to have had his twelve children born in the order related in xxix.32-35, xxx.1-24,—to have acquired wealth there, xxxi.18, and then to have returned to his father Isaac at Hebron, xxxi.18, xxxv.27. It is very possible, however, that E may have allowed *twenty years* for the births of these children in Charran, so that the last of them was born when Jacob was about sixty, as Esau and Jacob were born to Isaac at sixty, xxv.26: and J may have sought to fill up in some measure this nearly blank interval of twenty years with the incidents recorded by him in xxix–xxxi.

184. Thus Joseph would be 17, xxxvii.2[a], according to E, when Jacob was 77, and therefore 70 when Jacob was 130, at the latter's going-down to Egypt, xlvii.9, and consequently about *sixty* years old, instead of thirty, when he 'stood before Pharaoh,' xli.46, ten years previously, xlv.6. It is this Jehovistic notice in xli.46 which is the disturbing element, and throws the whole story into confusion. For, if Joseph was 30 years old then, and therefore 40 at Jacob's coming to Egypt, (when the latter was 130, xlvii.9,) Joseph must have been born when Jacob was 90, and this was 14 years after Jacob's going to Charran, *comp.* xxix.25–35, xxxi.41, so that he must have gone thither at the age of *seventy-six*—that is, *thirty-six years after Esau's marriage*. Thus, as the story now stands, we have—

(i) Isaac and Rebekah waiting nearly forty years, though Esau's Hittite wives were a 'bitterness of spirit' to them, before Isaac thought of sending Jacob to get a wife in Charran;

(ii) Jacob, at this mature age of 76, persuaded by his mother, who was nearly 120 years old, xxv.20,26, to play a base trick upon his brother;

(iii) Esau, at the same age of 76, still represented as an active huntsman;

(iv) Esau marrying his third wife nearly forty years after marrying the other two, xxviii.6–9;

(v) Jacob, at seventy-six, first beginning to think seriously of marriage, though his father and brother had married at forty;

(vi)—worst of all!—*Rachel*, though loved so passionately, kept *seven years longer* waiting for her husband, already so far advanced in years, who must have been 83 before he married her, xxix.20,21!

## 185. xxviii.1–9, *Elohist.*

(i) *v.*1, 'thou shalt not take a wife out of the daughters of Canaan,' refers to xxvi.35.

(ii) *v.*1,6,8, 'daughters of Canaan,' for which J has 'daughters of the Canaanite,' xxiv.37.

(iii) *v.*2, קוּם, 'arise,' = start, used only here by E, see (63.xxv).

(iv) *v.*2,5,6,7, 'Padan-Aram,' (157.v).

(v) *v.*2, 'to Padan-Aram, to the house of Bethuel thy mother's brother,' 'out of the daughters of Laban thy mother's brother,' *v.*5, 'to Padan-Aram, unto Laban the son of Bethuel the Aramæan, Rebekah's brother,' (157.iv).

*(vi) *v.*3, פָּרָה וְרָבָה, 'fructify and multiply,' (1.iv).

*(vii) *v.*3, 'that thou mayst be for a company of peoples,' (95.xii).

*(viii) *v.*4, 'and give to thee the *blessing of Abraham*,' refers to xvii.8.

*(ix) *v.*4, 'to thee and to thy seed with thee,' (46.xviii).

*(x) *v.*4, 'with (אֶת) thee,' as a sort of expletive, (19.xiv).

*(xi) *v.*4, 'to thy inheriting the land of thy sojournings, which Elohim gave to Abraham,' (95.xxi).

*(xii) *v.*4, 'land of thy sojournings,' (95.xxii).

(xiii) *v.*4, 'which Elohim gave to Abraham';

*comp.* 'the land which I gave to Abraham,' xxxv.12.

N.B. The language of Isaac in *v.*4 seems clearly to show that E had not recorded any *separate* gift of the land to Isaac, nor therefore, probably, any appearance of El Shaddai to him (95.xxi.N.B.). The gift to *Isaac* was made in the words addressed to Abraham, xvii.8, 'And I have given to thee, *and to thy seed after thee*, the land of thy sojournings.'

(xiv) *v.*6, 'and Esau saw that Isaac blessed Jacob,' refers to *v.*1, 'Isaac called unto Jacob and blessed him,'– not to the Jehovistic account in xxvii.27–29.

(xv) *v.*7, 'hearken unto (אֶל),' (139.ix).

(xvi) *v.*8, 'be evil in the eyes of,'—as in $E_2$(xxi.11,12), J(xxxviii.10, xlviii.17); but E has 'in the eyes of,' xxiii.11,18.

(xvii) *v.*9, 'Nebaioth,' as in xxv.13.

(xviii) *v.*9, עַל, 'upon,' as in J(xxxi.50, xlviii.22) = in addition to his other two wives named in xxvi.34.

Both HUPFELD and BOEHMER give the above to E.

## 186. xxviii.10–22, *Jehovist.*

(i) The sudden change from 'Padan-Aram' in the previous section, *v.*2,5,6,7, to 'Charran' in *v.*10 implies a change of authorship, and takes us at once to the Jehovistic passage, xxvii.43, 'arise, flee thou unto Laban my brother to Charran.'

(ii) *v.*10, 'and Jacob went-out from Beersheba,' refers to xxvi.23–33, where Isaac is supposed to be settled at Beersheba.

(iii) *v.*11, פָּגַע, 'reach,' as in xxxii.1(2),—also E(xxiii.8).

*(iv) *v.*11, 'and he passed the night there,' as in xxxii.13(14), *comp.* (99 viii).

*(v) *v.*12, מֻצָּב, 'set-up,' *v.*13, נִצָּב עָל, 'standing by,' (97.v,vi).

(vi) *v.*12, 'angels of Elohim,' as in xxxii.1; *comp.* xxxi.11.

*(vii) *v.*13, 'and behold Jehovah standing by him!';

*comp.* 'and behold three men standing by him!' xviii.2, one of whom is identified with Jehovah in *v.*1,13, &c.

*(viii) *v.*13, 'I am Jehovah, the Elohim of Abraham thy father, and the Elohim of Isaac,' (47.xii).

(ix) *v.*13, 'the land which thou liest upon, to thee will I give it and to thy seed';

*comp.* 'the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed,' xiii.15.

(x) *v.*13, 'to thee will I give it and to thy seed,' (59.vii).

(xi) *v.*14, 'and thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth'; *comp.* xiii.16(63.xxiv).

*(xii) *v.*14, פָּרַץ, 'spread-abroad,' xxviii.14, xxx.30,43, xxxviii.29.

(xiii) *v.*14, 'seaward, and eastward, and northward, and southward';

*comp.* 'northward, and southward, and eastward, and seaward,' xiii.14.

(xiv) *v.*14, 'and by thee shall all families of the ground be blessed,' as in xii.3;

*comp.* 'by them shall my name be called,' xlviii.16;

'by thee shall Israel bless,' xlviii.20:

$E_2$ has 'by Isaac shall my seed be called,' xxi.12;

D has 'by thy seed shall all nations of the earth bless themselves,' xviii.18, xxii.18, xxvi.4.

N.B. The phrase 'and by thy seed' is brought in awkwardly at the end of *v.*14, as if the original writer had completed his sentence without it, as he does in xii.3. And it is noticeable that it is D, who in xxii.18, xxvi.4 has 'by thy seed' instead of the Jehovistic 'by thee.' It is possible that in xxviii.14 the clause, 'and by thy seed,' may be a Deuteronomistic addition to the original verse.

*(xv) *v.*14, 'families of the *ground*,' *v.*15, 'unto this *ground*,' (3.iii).

(xvi) *v.*15, 'I am with (עִם) thee,' (163.x).

(xvii) *v.*15, 'I am with thee and will keep thee,' *v.*20, 'if Elohim will be with me and will keep me';

*comp.* 'I am with thee and will bless thee,' xxvi.24.

*(xviii) *v.*15, 'in all [the way] which thou art going,' (99.xii).

*(xix) *v.*15, עָזַב, 'forsake,' (3.xviii).

*(xx) *v.*15, עַד אֲשֶׁר אִם, 'until,' (166.xxi).

(xxi) *v.*16, יֵשׁ, 'there is,' (141.xxxviii).

(xxii) *v.*16 'and I knew it not'; *comp.* 'and he knew it not,' xix.33,35.

(xxiii) *v.*17, כִּי אִם, 'except,' xxviii.17, xxxii.26(27),28(29), xxxix.6,9, xlvii.18, —also E(xxxv.10), $E_2$(xl.14), D(xv.4).

(xxiv) *v.*18, 'rise-early in the morning,' (99.xlix).

(xxv) *v.*18, 'and placed it as a pillar, and poured oil on its top,' imitated from xxxv.14(E).

(xxvi) *v.*19, indirect derivation of the name Bethel = בֵּית־אֵל, 'House of El,' (3.iv).

(xxvii) *v.*19, וְאוּלָם, 'and nevertheless,' as in xlviii.19.

(xxviii) *v.*19, רִאשֹׁנָה, 'the first,' as in xiii.4, xxxviii.28.

(xxix) *v.*20, 'if Elohim will be with (עִם) me,' (163.x).

*(xxx) *v.*20, 'in this way which I am going,' (99.xii).

*(xxxi) *v.*20, 'and give me bread to eat';

*comp.* 'the bread which he was eating,' xxxix.6,—also 'eat bread,' xxxi.54, xxxvii.25, xlii.25, and 'bread' = food, xli.54,55, xliii.31, xlvii.13,15,17,17,19.

*(xxxii) *v.*20, בֶּגֶד, 'garment,' (141.lviii).

(xxxiii) *v.*21, 'in peace,' as in xxvi.29,31, *comp.* xxxiii.18, xliv.17, also D(xv.15).

(xxxiv) *v.*22, 'tithes' mentioned, as paid to *Jehovah*, here only in Genesis, and by the same author who alone mentions 'altars' (45.ii), and divine worship (5.xxx): but $J_2$ speaks of tithes being paid to *Melchizedek*, xiv.20.

187. In this section the Jehovist has used repeatedly the name 'Elohim.' We have seen that he has already employed it as a personal name, in iv.25, ix.27, xxii.8,12, and הָאֱלֹהִים in xxii.1,3,9, xxvii.28; but it is remarkable that 'Elohim' occurs *seven* times in this short passage. This has led HUPFELD, *p.*20, to assign this section to $E_2$, except *v.*13–16,19, which he gives to the Jehovist. But the fact appears to be that the name 'Elohim' has been used here by the Jehovist, with unusual frequency and emphasis, with an express view to the derivation of the name 'Beth-El' in *v.*19. Besides which, 'angels of Elohim' in *v.*12 corresponds to 'sons of Elohim' in vi.2; and elsewhere we find both 'angel of Jehovah' and 'angel of Elohim' used by a Jehovistic writer in the same context, *e.g.* in Ju.xiii.3,6,9,13, vi.20,21. Again, the expressions 'Elohim of Abraham thy father,' 'Elohim of Isaac,' in *v.*13, are quite in the style of the Jehovist (47.xii),—as HUPFELD himself admits, by assigning this verse to him. In *v.*17,22, the name 'Elohim' occurs in the connection 'House of Elohim,' and is evidently used with direct reference to the name 'Beth-El.' And thus

there remain only *two* instances where Elohim is used as a personal name, *viz.* *v.*20, 'If Elohim will be with me,' and *v.*21, 'then Jehovah shall be to me for Elohim'=shall be 'my Elohim,' *comp.* xxvii.20,—both which cases are also manifestly to be explained by the writer's intention to derive here the name 'Beth-El.'

188. BOEHMER gives only *v.*10[a], 'and he went to Charran,' to B(J), *v.*10[b]–12,17–22, to C($E_2$), and *v.*13–16 to the *Compiler*—observing, however, *p.*221, that these last verses—

contain a whole string of references to B(J), and affinities of diction with him—

to whom we assign the whole section. In fact, says BOEHMER,—

all these coincidences, on account of which the passage cannot belong to C($E_2$) might incline one to assign it to B(J), for whom also HUPFELD decides. But it has no proper connection in B. That narrative steps on from the remark, *v.*10[a], 'and he went towards Charran,' to what happened to him in Charran, xxix.2,&c.

*Ans.* BOEHMER's argument turns entirely on his own assumption,—that xxix.2 followed originally in J after xxviii.10[a],—from which we dissent altogether. We see no reason, therefore, to reject the manifest results of the analysis, or to suppose with BOEHMER that 'the Compiler made this addition *v.*13–16 from his own hand, imitating after his fashion the style of the earlier writings, and *here by accident almost exclusively that of B*(J).'

189. Believing, however, with HUPFELD that *v.*13–16 is due to the Jehovist, we must now consider his reasons, *p.*156, &c., for assigning the rest to $E_2$.

'The following Jehovistic narrative about the divine appearance at Bethel, *v.*11,&c. is mixed with another account of $E_2$, which is carried on afterwards. Still the two accounts may be separated from each other with tolerable certainty, from a consideration of the difference between the points of view from which they are written, and their inner connection. Only at the beginning in *v.*11 the two accounts seem so interlaced that one must have suffered somewhat from the other. With most distinctness the words, 'and he took of the stones of the place and placed them for his pillows,' may be assigned to $E_2$, which stones play a prominent part in what follows, *v.*18,22,[(1)] and these words imply at all events the first words 'and he lighted on a place,' in which we have פָּגַע בְּ as in xxxii.1(2), probably also due to $E_2$. On the other hand, the rest of the verse, 'and he spent the night there, because the sun had set,' are not required for $E_2$, and may belong to J—'and he passed the night there,' as in xxxii.13, *comp.* *v.*21,—'he lay down,' referred to in *v.*13, 'the ground upon which thou liest down.' Yet certainly the matter which belongs to $E_2$ is more clearly defined than that of J;

and so it will be best to leave to the former the whole verse, and to suppose that a small hiatus may exist here in the J. narrative, which has arisen through its being intermixed with the other. Then follows *v.*13–16; . . . and here the whole passage, not merely through the repeated use of the name Jehovah, but also through the characteristic expressions of the Jehovist, is recognised and generally allowed to be his . . . To this, however, belongs manifestly also, as the result of the 'appearance' and the object of the whole story, *v.*19, the naming of the place 'Beth-El' = God's House, (*i.e.* the place where God is present and active,) together with the historical notice of the older name. Without this verse, the narrative would remain without point, and especially the feature in *v.*16, the amazement of Jacob, would be unmeaning.[2] That it does not belong to $E_2$, however, appears from this, that the name does not occur with this writer till after the fulfilment of Jacob's vow in xxxv.7, and consequently the place still bears the old name 'Luz' there in *v.*6.

'The account of $E_2$ goes on next, after *v.*11 above considered, with the story of the dream of the ladder, *v.*12. Upon this follows *v.*17, 'and he feared, and said, How fearful is this place! here is none other than a House of God, here the gate of heaven,'—which utterance forms with the preceding *v.*16 in the J. account a strange repetition and parellelism,[3] and in the expression 'gate of heaven' refers manifestly to the heavenly ladder, on which the angels of God went up and down, *v.*12,—as also in 'House of God' to the vow, *v.*22, to make such a House out of the stone-pillar. Then, on the following morning, *v.*18, we have the erection and anointing of the stone, which he had used as a pillow, to be a pillar, and, *v.*20–22, the vow that, if God would 'protect him on this way,' and bring him back happily, he would make on this stone-pillar a House of God, and tithe all that God would give him. This passage, containing the vow,—consisting of a number of propositions, which prescribe the condition, with the vow itself as conclusion, *v.*22,—is all from one hand and without any foreign elements; for the 'Jehovah' in the last proposition,—'and if Jehovah will be (וְהָיָה יְהוָה) to me for a God,'—can only have entered by an oversight—perhaps, having arisen from the foregoing וְהָיָה—since the phrase 'to be for Elohim,' *i.e.* to show Himself as Elohim (guardian-deity) is an Elohistic formula, originating with the primary document,[4] xvii.7,8, E.vi.7. With this the conditions here are finally summed up; and there is neither ground nor purpose to be seen, for which we should suppose it (with Tuch) to be an interpolation of the Jehovist or Compiler. This is true also of the last clause, the vow of the tithe, which in itself—after the analogy of the tithe paid by Abraham in xiv.20, [ascribed by Hupfeld to J, by us to $J_2$], and the manner of the Jehovist generally—would rather refer us to him. Here, however, it cannot be assigned to J, since that writer has no vow, and therefore no place for the clause.[5]

'Hence there stand here side by side *two complete independent accounts* of the divine appearance in question,' &c.

190. We reply to the above as follows :—

(1) If *v.*18,22, belongs to J, as our analysis seems to show, then *v.*11[a] will also

belong to him, according to HUPFELD'S own reasoning; and, since he admits that *v.*11[b] is strongly Jehovistic, the whole verse, *v.*11, falls to this writer.

(2) *v.*17 seems to *require* *v.*16; because otherwise, if *v.*17 followed *v.*12, as HUPF. supposes, Jacob would be still *asleep*, and *speaking in his sleep*—not to say that, after *v.*12, the verb in *v.*17 would seem rather to need the subject 'Jacob' to be expressed once more, as it is in *v.*16. It appears to us that *v.*17 follows very naturally after *v.*16.

(3) To this we fully assent; but, on our view, we are not under any necessity of assuming an 'oversight', to account for the occurrence of 'Jehovah' in *v.*21.

(4) The formula 'to be for Elohim' *originated* in the Pentateuch certainly with E: but it may have been used by J in this passage, where the sense expressly required it. It is almost equivalent to the phrase which HUPFELD admits him to have used in xxvii.20, 'Jehovah thy Elohim.' But, in fact, *this* difficulty remains in any case, even on HUPFELD'S supposition, which removes the word 'Jehovah,' but leaves the sentence still, 'and shall be to me for Elohim,' which though 'originating,' as he says, with E, he here ascribes to $E_2$, but we to J.

(5) According to our view, this vow about the tithes—as it *ought rather* on HUPFELD'S own showing—so can and must be assigned, with all the rest of the section, to the Jehovist.

191. The question now arises, How can we account for the existence of the above account of the origin of the name 'Bethel,' on Jacob's journey *to* Charran, when we have a counterpart narrative of the very same event taking place twenty years afterwards on Jacob's return *from* Charran, xxxv.15? On our view, that the Jehovist wrote to supplement the older document, the explanation is very simply this, precisely similar to that which we have already given (174), to account for the three stories of the misadventures of the patriarchs' wives in xii.10–20, xx.1–17, xxvi.1,2,6–11. The first and last of these, by the hand of J, were meant (as we suppose) to have been substituted for the other, which had been already inserted by $E_2$, and which latter it was intended to cancel, though by some accident all three have been retained in the text—the main objects having been in this instance to remove the event in Abraham's case to an earlier and more fitting period in his life, and to introduce another enlivening incident in the life of Isaac, which was felt to be very brief and defective as it stood.

192. And so it seems to be here. In xxxv.9–15 we have from the hand of E a curt account of *two* notable events,—the changing of Jacob's name to 'Israel,' *v.*10, (without any distinct explanation of its meaning,) and the giving the name 'Bethel,' *v.*15. Both these, according to E, take place at the same point of time, *after* Jacob's return from Charran, whither he had gone by his father's direction to get himself a wife, xxviii.1–5, without any unpleasant circumstances, or any previous quarrel with his brother. The Jehovist, however, thinks it necessary to fill up to some extent the blanks left in Jacob's story by the older writer; and thus he encourages Jacob upon the way with the divine assurance of protection and blessing, with a view to introducing the account of his further doings in xxxi, in which frequent reference is made to this section. Hence he determined (as we suppose) to expand, as before, the single story of E in xxxv. 9-15 into two separate narratives—*viz.* xxviii.10-22, in which he gives an account of a divine appearance to Jacob on his way *to* Charran, and derives the name 'Bethel,' and xxxii.24–32, in which he explains at full length the origin of the name 'Israel' (and 'Penuel') *after* Jacob's return from Charran. We suppose, as before, that he intended to cancel the original story of E in xxxv.9–15, but let it stand as it was for a season, perhaps from a wish to reconsider it, or perhaps from a modest unwillingness to destroy this portion of the old Elohistic story; and so it has been permanently retained in the text.

193. As this is a critical point in the analysis, and our judgment upon this passage will materially affect our conclusions as to some of the following passages of Genesis, it may be desirable to collect here in one view all the instances, in which the Jehovist makes use of the name Elohim in the Book of Genesis, not taking into account the compound expression 'Jehovah-Elohim,' which occurs twenty times in ii.4$^{b}$–iii.24.

N.B. Those marked with (H) are recognised also by HUPFELD as Jehovistic; and (? H) denotes those about which he either has not expressed his views at all, or spoken doubtfully.

(i) *Elohim or El used as a personal name of the Divine Being.*

'Is it so that Elohim hath said,' iii.1(H);
'Elohim hath said, Ye shall not eat of it,' iii.3(H);
'Elohim doth know that ye shall be as Elohim &c.,' iii.5(H);
'Elohim hath appointed to me another seed,' iv.25(H)
'Elohim shall enlarge Japheth,' ix.27(H);
'Laughter hath Elohim caused to me,' xxi.6(H);
'the name of Jehovah, El Everlasting,' xxi.33(H);
'ELOHIM tempted Abraham,' xxii.1(? H);
'the place of which ELOHIM had told him,' xxii.1,9 (? H)
'Elohim will see for Himself a lamb,' xxii.8(? H);
'now I know that thou fearest Elohim,' xxii.12 (? H);
'ELOHIM give thee of the dew of heaven,' xxvii.28 (H);
'if Elohim will be with me,' xxviii.20;
'Jehovah shall be to me for Elohim, xxviii.21;
'am I instead of Elohim,' xxx.2 (H);
'Elohim suffered him not to do evil with me,' xxxi.7;
'Elohim hath taken away your father's cattle,' xxxi.9;
'what Elohim hath said unto thee, do,' xxxi.16;
'and Elohim came to Laban the Aramæan in a dream by night, and said to him,' xxxi.24;
'Elohim is witness between me and thee,' xxxi.50;
'thou hast been a prince with Elohim,' xxxii.28(H);
'I have seen Elohim face to face,' xxxii.30(H);
'the children which Elohim hath granted to thy servant,' xxxiii.5(H);
'I have seen thy face, like seeing the face of Elohim,' xxxiii.10(H);
'Elohim hath granted to me,' xxxiii.11(H);
'And Elohim said unto Jacob,' xxxv.1;
'EL who appeared unto thee,' xxxv.1;
'EL who answered me,' xxxv.3;
'there ELOHIM was revealed unto him,' xxxv.7;
'and sin against Elohim,' xxxix.9(H);
'Elohim hath made me forget my labour,' xli.51(H);
'Elohim hath made me fruitful, &c.,' xli.52(H);
'I fear Elohim,' xlii.18(? H);
'what is this Elohim hath done to us?' xlii.28(? H);
'El Shaddai give you compassion before the man,' xliii.14(? H);
'your Elohim hath given you treasure,' xliii.23(? H);
'Elohim grant to thee,' xliii.29(? H);
'Elohim hath found-out the iniquity of thy servants,' xliv.16(H);
'Elohim hath sent me before you for saving-of-life,' xlv.5(? H)
'Elohim hath sent me before you . . . to save-life to you,' xlv.7(? H);

'not you have sent me hither, but Elohim,' xlv.8(? H);
'Elohim hath placed me for lord to all Egypt,' xlv.9(? H);
'Elohim said to Israel in visions of the night,' xlvi.2(? H);
'I am EL, the Elohim of thy father,' xlvi.3(? H);
'the children which Elohim hath given to me,' xlviii.9(? H);
'Elohim hath made me to see thy seed,' xlviii.11(? H);
'Elohim, before whom my fathers . . . have walked,' xlviii.15(? H);
'Elohim, who hath tended me from my being unto this day,' xlviii.15(? H);
'Elohim place thee as Ephraim and Manasseh,' xlviii.20(? H);
'Elohim will be with you,' xlviii.21(? H);
'am I instead of Elohim?' l.19(H);
'Elohim meant it for good,' l.20;
'Elohim shall surely visit you,' l.24,25.

(ii) *Elohim or El used as an appellative.*

'Jehovah, the Elohim of Shem,' ix.26(H);
'Jehovah, the Elohim of heaven and the Elohim of earth,' xxiv.3(H);
'Jehovah, the Elohim of heaven,' xxiv.7(H);
'Jehovah, the Elohim of Abraham my master,' xxiv.12,27,42,48(H);
'I am the Elohim of Abraham thy father,' xxvi.24(H);
'Jehovah thy Elohim brought it to me,' xxvii.20(H);
'I am Jehovah, the Elohim of Abraham thy father and the Elohim of Isaac,' xxviii.13(H);
'the Elohim of my father has been with me,' xxxi.5;
'I am the EL of Bethel,' xxxi.13;
'the Elohim of your father said unto me,' xxxi.29;
'the Elohim of my father, the Elohim of Abraham and the Dread of Isaac,' xxxi.42;
'the Elohim of Abraham and the Elohim of Nahor, the Elohim of their father,' xxxi.53;
'the Dread of his father Isaac,' xxxi.53;
'the Elohim of my father Abraham and the Elohim of my father Isaac, Jehovah,' xxxii.9(H);
'and he called it El-Elohim of Israel,' xxxiii.20(H);
'and he called the place El-Beth-El,' xxxv.7;
'your Elohim and the Elohim of your father,' xliii.23(? H);
'the Elohim of his father Isaac,' xlvi.1,3;
'the Elohim of thy father,' xlvi.3, l.17;
'the EL of thy father,' xlix.25(H).

(iii) *Elohim used in popular phrases.*

'sons of Elohim,' vi.2;
'angels of Elohim,' xxviii.12, xxxii.1(? H);
'house of Elohim,' xxviii.17,22;
'angel of ELOHIM,' xxxi.11;
'camp of Elohim,' xxxii.2(? H);
'terror of Elohim,' xxxv.5.

194. It will be seen that, up to the end of xxviii, HUPFELD allows *eight* of the *fifteen* cases in (i), where Elohim is used as a personal name, to be Jehovistic, and speaks doubtfully about *five* more, or rather he admits (131) that xxii.1–13, in which these five occur, would certainly be regarded as Jehovistic, 'but for the name Elohim.' Thus we may fairly claim him as admitting *thirteen* of these *fifteen* cases: and our own analysis above seems to us decisive in respect of the other two instances.

Of the twelve cases in (ii), up to the end of xxviii, HUPFELD allows every one to be Jehovistic, as of those in (iii) he allows that in vi.2, though not that in xxviii.12. But plainly if xxviii.20,21, are due to J, so also is xxviii.12.

195. Thus, up to the present point, we may consider that we have good reason for assigning all the above *twenty-nine* instances of the use of 'Elohim,' besides the twenty of 'Jehovah-Elohim' in ii.4$^{b}$—iii.24, to the Jehovistic writer. And this conclusion will be of great importance to us in judging of similar cases that may present themselves to us hereafter. The Elohist never uses 'Jehovah' throughout the Book of Genesis, nor does the Second Elohist; but the Jehovist frequently uses 'Elohim,' and *more freely*, as we believe, *in the older passages* of those which we ascribe to him. In his latest insertions, such as xviii, xix,xxiv,xxvii, he seems more persistently to use 'Jehovah.'

196. xxix.1–35, *Jehovist*, except *v.*24,29,32$^{ab}$,33$^{ad}$,34$^{a}$,35$^{ad}$, for which see (203.iv,204,207).

*(i) *v.*1, 'lift up the feet and go,' *comp.* the formulæ 'lift up the voice and weep' (180.xl), 'lift up the eyes and see,' (63.xv).

*(ii) *v.*1, 'land of the sons of the east,' *comp.* 'land of the east,' xxv.6, and for 'east' (קֶדֶם) see (3.vi).

*(iii) *v.*2, רֶבֶץ, 'couch,' (5.ix).

(iv) *v.*4, 'my brethren,' as in xix.7.

(v) *v.*4, 'Charran,' refers to xxviii.10.

(vi) *v.*5, 'the son of Nahor,' as in xxii.23, xxiv.47:

E mentions only Bethuel, xxv.20, xxviii.2.

*(vii) *v.*10, נָגַשׁ, 'come-near,' (97.xxxii).

*(viii) *v.*11, 'and Jacob kissed Rachel,' *v.*13, 'and kissed him,' (180.xxv).

(ix) *v.*11, 'lift-up the voice and weep,' as in xxvii.38 (180.xl).

(x) *v.*11, בָּכָה, 'weep,' (180 xli).

*(xi) *v.*12, 'ran and told,' (97.viii).

*(xii) *v.*13, 'at Laban's hearing,' (141.xlvi).

*(xiii) *v.*13, 'he ran to meet him, and embraced him, and kissed him,' as in xxxiii.4; *comp.* 'ran to meet' (97.vii), 'and he embraced them and kissed them,' xlviii.10.

(xiv) *v.*13, 'and he recounted to Laban all these things';

*comp.* 'and the servant recounted to Isaac all the things that he had done,' xxiv.66.

(xv) *v.*14, 'my bone and my flesh art thou';

*comp.* 'this is bone out of my bone and flesh out of my flesh,' ii.23;
'our brother, our flesh, is he,' xxxvii.27.

(xvi) *v.*15, הֲכִי, 'is it that,' as in xxvii.36.

*(xvii) *v.*16, 'the elder,' 'the younger,' *v.*18, 'thy younger daughter,' (47.viii).

(xviii) *v.*17, 'fair of appearance and fair of form,' as in xxxix.6.

(xix) *v.*17, 'fair of form,' (59.xvi).

*(xx) *v.*18, 'and Jacob loved Rachel,' (162.v).

(xxi) *v.*20, 'some days,' as in xxvii.44.

*(xxii) *v.*21, הָבָה, 'give here,' (55.iv).

(xxiii) *v* 21, 'my days are fulfilled';

*comp.* 'forty days were fulfilled for him, for so are the days fulfilled,' l.3: E has 'her days were fulfilled,' xxv.24.

*(xxiv) *v.*21,23,30, בּוֹא, 'go-in,' used of sexual intercourse (86.iii).

(xxv) *v.*22, 'men of the place,' (166.i).

(xxvi) *v.*22, 'and he made a feast,' *comp.* xix.3, xxvi.30—$E_2$(xxi.8, xl.20).

(xxvii) *v.*25, 'and he said unto Laban, What is this thou hast done to me?';

*comp.* 'and Abimelech said, What is this thou hast done to us?' xxvi.10.

(xxviii) *v.*26, 'it is not done so,' *comp.* 'so it is not done,' xxxiv.7.

*(xxix) *v.*26, הַצְּעִירָה, 'the younger,' הַבְּכִירָה, 'the elder,' (47.viii).

(xxx) *v.*27, גַּם־זֹאת, *v.*33, גַּם־זֶה, 'this also,' xxxv.17, xliv.29.

*(xxxi) *v.*30, 'and he loved also Rachel more than Leah';

*comp.* 'and Israel loved Joseph more than all his sons,' xxxvii.3;
'their father loved him more than all his brethren,' xxxvii.4.

*(xxxii) *v.*31,33$^b$, שָׂנֵא, 'hate,' (141.lx).

(xxxiii) *v.*31, 'He *opened* her womb';

*comp.* 'Jehovah hath *bound* me from bearing,' xvi.2;
'Jehovah had strictly *bound* every womb,' xx.18.

*(xxxiv) *v.*31, 'and Rachel was barren,' (161.ii).

(xxxv) *v.*32$^c$, 'for she said &c.,' as in xvi.13, *comp.* (3.xvi).

(xxxvi) *v.*32$^c$, 'for Jehovah hath seen at my affliction';

*comp.* 'for Jehovah hath hearkened unto thy affliction,' xvi.11.

*(xxxvii) *v.*32$^c$, עָנְיִי, 'affliction,' (86.viii).

(xxxviii) *v.*32$^{cd}$,33$^{bc}$,34$^{bc}$, all refer to the preceding J. account of Jacob's partiality for Rachel, and neglect of Leah, *v.*18,20,25,30.

(xxxix) *v.*34$^{b}$,35$^{b}$, 'this time,' (3.xv).

*(xl) *v.*34$^{a}$,35$^{c}$, 'therefore (עַל־כֵּן) he (she) called his name Levi (Judah)'—direct derivations as in (55 xii).

(xli) Reuben (רְאוּבֵן) is derived in *v.*32 from רָאָה בְּעָנְיִי, 'He saw at my affliction,'- though it would seem much more simple to derive it from רְאוּ בֵן, 'see a son!'—Simeon (שִׁמְעוֹן) in *v.*33, from שָׁמַע, 'hearken,'—Levi (לֵוִי) in *v.*34 from לָוָה, 'adhere,'--Judah (יְהוּדָה) in *v.*35, from יָדָה, 'praise,' (3.iv).

197. xxx.1–24.

There is, as HUPFELD observes, p.43, no visible trace of any interruption in the flow of the narrative, or of any connecting link interpolated between the account in xxx.1, &c. and the preceding context. And yet the latter contains only 'Jehovah,' xxix.31,32,33,35, which name recurs again in xxx.24$^{b}$,27,30, while in the interval 'Elohim' is used repeatedly, *nine* times. It is true that in one or two of these latter instances 'Elohim' might, and would most probably, have been used by a Jehovistic writer, *e.g.* in *v.*2, 'am I instead of Elohim?' a phrase which seems to have been proverbial, *comp.* 1.19,2K.v 7, and in *v.*8, 'wrestlings of Elohim,'=mighty wrestlings. But, when we observe the *constant* use of 'Jehovah' in xxix.31–35, we can hardly suppose that the repeated employment of 'Elohim' in xxx.6,17,18,20,22,22,23, is due *wholly* to the same writer as the former passage,—at least, if writing at the same point of time. Accordingly, we shall find, on closer examination, in this very intervening section, xxx.1–24, some strong indications of the mixture of more than one document, and, as we believe, some clear traces of the style of the Elohist.

198. xxx.22–24, *Elohist*, except *v.*24$^{b}$, *Jehovist*.

(i) We take as our starting-point *v.*22$^{a}$, where we have a well-known E. formula, which occurs in viii.1,xix.29, exactly as here, with 'Elohim' twice repeated, viz.—

'and Elohim remembered Rachel, and Elohim &c.';

*comp.* 'and Elohim remembered Noah, and Elohim &c.'; viii.1;

'and Elohim remembered Abraham, and Elohim &c.' xix.29;

'and Elohim remembered His covenant, and Elohim &c.' E.ii.24;

*comp.* also ix.15,16,E.vi.5.

It seems, therefore, most probable that *v.*22[a] is really due to E.

(ii) But *v.*22[a] brings with it the rest of the verse, 'and Elohim hearkened unto her, and opened her womb,' where also we have, 'hearken unto (שָׁמַע אֶל) (139.ix)—the only form which E uses, whereas in those parts of Genesis, which are not due to E, we find this form, indeed, *four* times, xvi.11, xxi.17, xxxiv.17,24, but 'hearken to (לְ or בְּ),' *eight* times, xvi.2, xxi.12, xxii.18, xxvi.5, xxvii.8,13,43, xxx.6[b], which E *never* uses.

(iii) Thus we have now recovered *v.*22 entirely for E; for plainly the last clause, 'and opened her womb,' cannot be separated from the clause preceding, 'and Elohim hearkened unto her.'

(iv) But *v.*22 brings with it also *v.*23[a]—'and she conceived and bare a son';

*comp.* 'and Sarah conceived and bare a son to Abraham,' xxi.2.

(v) And *v.*23[a] seems to bring with it *v.*23[b], with its 'Elohim'—

'and she said, Elohim hath taken away (אָסַף) my reproach';

so that now *v.*22,23, belong, as it appears, to E.

(vi) Again *v.*24[a] 'and she called his name Joseph (יוֹסֵף)' = 'he takes away,' is plainly part of the same context, and contains a *first* derivation of the name 'Joseph,' not direct, but by way of allusion to Rachel's utterance in *v.*23[b] (95.xiii).

(vii) But *v.*24[b] contains a *second* derivation of the name 'Joseph,' (יֹסֵף, = 'he shall add,') as if from יָסַף 'add,'—which is manifestly an addition to the original story, and betrays itself as Jehovistic by the name 'Jehovah'—

'saying, Jehovah *shall add* to me another son';

*comp.* 'Elohim hath appointed to me another seed,' iv.25.

It may be noted also that this is the only instance in which the inf. form, לֵאמֹר, 'saying,' is used in the whole narrative.

199. We have thus seen reason for assigning *v.*22,23,24[a], to E, and *v.*24[b] to J: nor does it appear to us that there is any valid objection *against* this determination. Let us consider what may be said against it.

(i) HUPFELD observes, *p.*43, that *v.*22[c], 'and He opened her womb,' is *Jehovistic*.

*Ans.* It is true, this phrase does not occur in any other E. passage in Genesis; whereas it *does* occur in xxix.31, which is certainly Jehovistic, and HUPFELD'S view is further supported by the analogies of xvi.2, xx.18. But it can hardly be deemed *peculiar* to the Jehovist; and, in fact, it is used in E.xiii.2, N.xviii.15—passages which are assigned by KUENEN, (*Eng. Ed.*, *p.*34), and, as he says, note *p.*101, by other eminent critics, to the Elohist,—though, he adds, no '*proofs*, in the strict sense of the word, are produced for these positions.' But the *positive* evidence of *v.*22[a] outweighs by itself this merely negative argument.

(ii) It may be said that E makes the *father* give the name, xvi.15,xxi.3,—not the *mother*, as here, and that he uses altogether a more full and diffuse formula—

'and Abram called his son's name, which Hagar bare, Ishmael,' xvi.15;

'and Abram called the name of his son that was born to him, whom Sarah bare to him, Isaac,' xxi.3:

whereas here we have only briefly—

'and she called his name Joseph.'

But these *two* instances, xvi.15, xxi.3, are the only instances of the above kind which occur in the E. portions of Genesis, and both Ishmael and Isaac were named under peculiar circumstances. *Isaac* was so named by Abraham in obedience to an express Divine command, xvii.19; and *Ishmael* must have been named either by *Abraham*, or by *Sarah*, since the *maid* Hagar was not entitled to give the name—(*comp.* xxx.6,8, where *Rachel*, not *Bilhah*, and xxx.11,13, where *Leah*, not *Zilpah*, gives the name to the children of the maid)—and there was no special reason for bringing in Sarah, rather than Abraham, in xvi.15.

It is true that in v.3 the *father*, Adam, gives the name 'Seth'; but then the *mother's* name has never been mentioned anywhere by E; and we may observe that here in v.3 we have the identical short formula (with a change of gender) which we are now considering—'and he called his name Seth.'

Also, if our view of xxv.25,26, be correct, we see that in these other two instances the Elohist does *not* make the father give the name.

(iii) Lastly, it may be said, the practice of deriving names at all is not in the style of the Elohist. But here we think differently. It is *certain* that E has derived 'Abraham,' xvii.5, 'Sarah,' xvii.15, and 'Bethel,' xxxv.15; and, as we have shown (95.xiii), there can be little doubt that he has also alluded to the derivations of 'Isaac,' xvii.17, 'Ishmael,' xvii.20, 'Israel,' xxxv.10, and, as we believe, also of 'Seir,' 'Edom,' 'Esau,' and 'Jacob,' xxv.25,26. Here are *ten* names derived by him more or less distinctly; so that it is not unreasonable to suppose that he has here derived 'Joseph.' Rather, if he has actually derived Abraham and Sarah, Ishmael and Isaac, Edom, Seir, and Esau, Jacob and Israel, it seems *highly probable* that he would also derive the names—not of Joseph only, but—of all the twelve sons of Israel.

200. We proceed, then, on the assumption that we have now made it appear probable that xxx.22–24[a] belongs to E, and *v.*24[b] to J. But if E has given an account of the birth of Joseph and derived *his* name, it is, as we have just said, probable *à priori* that he has done the same also in the case of the other sons of Jacob. And this suspicion is confirmed as follows.

(i) If *v.*22,23, belongs to E,—

'and Elohim hearkened unto her, and he opened her womb, and she conceived, and bare &c.'—

then, no doubt, so also does *v.*17, where nearly the same words occur—

'and Elohim hearkened unto Leah, [whose womb *had* been already opened,] and she conceived, and bare, &c.'

(ii) And *v.*17, 'and she bare to Jacob a *fifth* son,'—N.B. 'bare *to Jacob*,' *comp.* 'bare *to Abraham*,' xvi.15,16, xxi.2,3,5,—implies that E had given an account of the first *four* sons.

(iii) Also *v.*17 brings with it *v.*18ᵃ, the derivation of the name 'Issachar' (יִשָּׂשכָר) from שָׂכָר, 'hire,'—which, taken with *v.*18, runs just exactly as in the case of Joseph—

'and Leah said, Elohim hath given me my hire, and she called his name Issachar';

*comp.* 'and she said, Elohim hath taken away my reproach, and she called his name Joseph,' xxx.23,24.

N.B. For *v.*18ᵇ see below (201.iv).

(iv) But this second example, *v.*17,18ᵃᶜ, combines with *v.*22–24ᵃ to show that E has most probably recorded the births, and derived the names, of *all* the sons of Jacob.

Upon the whole, therefore, we seem justified in ascribing to E the whole section xxx.1–24, except those verses or expressions, which from internal evidence we *must* assign to the Jehovist, who has manifestly, as appears from xxix.31–35,xxx.24ᵇ, had *something* to do with this passage.

201. We are now able to assign to E xxx.17,18ᵃᶜ,22–24ᵃ. But we obtain some other fragments of his story as follows.

(i) *v.*19, 'and she bare a sixth son to Jacob,' refers to the 'fifth' son, *v.*17, and has the full phrase 'bare *to Jacob*' as there.

(ii) *v.*20ᵃ derives indirectly the name Zebulun (זְבֻלוּן) from זָבַד, 'dower'; and, if we couple with it *v.*20ᶜ, we have just as in the case of Issachar and Joseph (200.iii)—

'and Leah said, Elohim hath dowered me with a good dowry, and she called his name Zebulun.'

(iii) But the above is plainly a very far-fetched derivation, like that of 'Abraham' in xvii.5, or of 'Esau' in xxv.25. Apparently J was not satisfied with it, and inserted a *second* derivation for Zebulun, just as he has done for Joseph in *v.*24ᵇ,—that is, he has interpolated *v.*20ᵇ—

'this time will my husband dwell with me, for I have borne to him six sons'—where Zebulun (זְבֻלוּן) is more appositely derived from זָבַל, 'dwell,' (N.B. a *rare* word, used nowhere else in the Bible), and where also we have the Jehovistic 'this time,' as in (3.xv), and an express reference to Jacob's partiality for Rachel, as described by this writer in xxix.18–30.

(iv) But now that we have restored the original E. forms of the notices in the case of Joseph, Issachar, and Zebulun, there can be little doubt that *v.*18 in its original form was also symmetrical with these, that is, it stood as *v.*18ᵃᶜ—

'and Leah said, Elohim hath given me my hire, and she called his name Issachar': so that *v.*18ᵇ has been interpolated by the Jehovist—

'because *I have given my maid* to my husband'—

where we have the same phrase 'I have given my maid' as in xvi.5; and where we also have the J. expression אֲשֶׁר, 'because,' as in xxxi.49, xxxiv.13.

202. We have now secured for E *v.*17,18ac,19,20ac,21–24a, having included also *v.*21, the notice about the birth of 'Dinah,' (though it does not derive her name),—in which, however, the words 'to Jacob' do *not* occur, as is the case also in *v.*23. But we proceed further with our enquiry.

The explanation of the name 'Issachar' in *v.*18ac, referred merely—as the Jehovist said, and explained more fully by means of *v.*18b—to the 'reward,' which Leah had received for giving her maid to Jacob. But in *v.*14–16 we have a *second* derivation of his name, as in the case of Zebulun and Joseph, from his being 'hired' for the night by Leah's 'mandrakes,' which shows itself to be Jehovistic by the following signs.

(i) *v.*14, קָצִיר, 'harvest,' as in viii.22, xlv.6.

*(ii) *v.*14, מָצָא, 'find,' (3.xiv).

(iii) *v.*14, נָא, 'I pray,' xii.11,13, xiii.8,9,14, &c., see (30.xix) in Chap. V of the Text: used *nowhere* in E.

(iv) *v.*15, מְעַט, 'little,' xviii.4, xxiv.17,43, xxvi.10, xxx.15,30, xliii.2,11,11, xliv.25: used *once* only in E, xlvii.9.

(v) *v.*15, 'is it little that thou hast taken my husband?' refers to Jacob's fondness for Rachel, xxix.18,20,25,30,31,32,33,34.

(vi) *v.*15, גַּם, *gam*, 'also,' iii.6,22, iv.4,22,26, &c., see (30.viii) in Chap. V of the Text: used *once* only in E, xvii.16.

*(vii) *v.*15,16, שָׁכַב(אֶת)עִם, 'lie with,' (99.lv).

*(viii) *v.*16, 'went-out to meet,' (97.vii).

*(ix) *v.*16, בּוֹא, 'go-in,' used of sexual intercourse, (86.iii).

(x) *v.*16, 'in that night,' (99.lvi).

203. Upon the whole, therefore, we conclude that *v.*14–16,18b, 20b,24b, belongs to J. But we obtain more for E, as follows:—

(i) *v.*18ac, as we have seen, refers to *v.*9b—

'and she took Zilpah her maid, and gave him to Jacob for wife';

*comp.* 'and she took Hagar her maid, and gave him to Abram for wife,' xvi.3.

(ii) *v.*17a, 'and Elohim hearkened unto Leah,' refers to *v.*9a, 'and Leah saw that she stood from bearing.'

(iii) Thus *v.*9 belongs to E, and if so, then, no doubt, so does *v.*10–13, with its full form, 'bare *to Jacob*,' *v.*10,12, and the *brief* derivation of Gad, *v.*11, (בָּגָד, 'a troop!') and of Asher, *v.*13, '(בְּאָשְׁרִי) my happiness! for the daughters will call-me-blessed (אִשְּׁרוּנִי).'

(iv) But $v.9^a$, 'Leah saw that she stood from bearing,' refers to xxix.$35^d$, 'and she stood from bearing,' which also, therefore, is Elohistic, and *not* Jehovistic, as HUPFELD allows, though he gives it to $E_2$, and not, as we, to E.

Thus we have gained for E $v.9$–$13,17,18^{ac},19,20^{ac},22$–$24^a$.

204. But, further, since it appears that E gave originally an account of *all* the sons, we may assign to him also certain portions of xxix.32–35, which record merely *births* and *names*, *viz.* $v.32^{ab},33^{ad},34^a,35^a$—the other parts of these verses being covered, it will be seen, by the analysis of (196), and shown to be Jehovistic. It is true that, in the E. statement of xxx.10,12,17,19, and also in $v.5,7$, which we shall show to be Elohistic (206.$\varepsilon,\eta$), we have the phrase 'bare *to Jacob*'; whereas in neither of the notices in xxix.$32^a,33^a,34^a,35^a$, does this formula occur; but neither is it found in $v.21,24^a$, as we have just seen. And $v.32^b$, 'and she called his name Reuben,' $v.33^d$, 'and she called his name Simeon,' resemble the other seven E. notices in xxx.8,11,13,18,20,21,$24^a$.

It is true also that in $v.33^a,34^a,35^a$, we have not the expressions, '*second* son,' '*third* son,' '*fourth* son,' so as to correspond to 'fifth' and 'sixth' in xxx.17,19, or to 'second' in xxx.7,12. But 'fifth' son was *required* in xxx.17, since the series of Leah's children had been interrupted by Bilhah's; and, in fact, as soon as a second wife came upon the stage, it was expedient to number their children. It was not so necessary in xxix.32–35, where only the children of one wife were concerned, and where enough was expressed by saying, 'and *she* conceived *again* and bare a son.' With $v.34^a,35^a$, contrast also J(xxxviii.5).

The mother's name is not mentioned in $v.33^a,34^a,35^a$, as is the case also in xxx.21,23.

205. The remainder of $v.32$–$35$ is certainly Jehovistic, except $v.35^d$, as above (203.iv). We may suppose that the Jehovist—as in the cases of Issachar, Zebulun, and Joseph—was not satisfied with the Elohistic etymology of the first four names,—or, at all events, wished to mark more distinctly the partiality of Jacob

for Rachel, which he himself had introduced into the story, but of which the Elohistic writer knew nothing,—and that he has modified accordingly, in his own style, the narrative of the first four births.

206. We have still to consider xxx.1–8.

(*a*) *v.*1[a], *Elohistic.*

(i) *v.*1[a], 'she bare not to Jacob,' reminds us of the E. formula in xvi.1, 'she bare not to him,' for which J has 'Sarai was barren,' xi.30, 'she (Rebekah) was barren,' xxv.21[a], 'Rachel was barren,' xxix.31.

(ii) *v.*1[a], '*and Rachel saw that* she bare not to Jacob';

*comp.* '*and Leah saw that* she stood from bearing,' *v.*9.

(iii) *v.*1[a], 'bare not *to Jacob*,' the full formula as in *v.*5,7,10,12,17,19.

(*β*) *v.*1[b]–3, *Jehovistic.*

(iv) *v.*1[b], 'and Rachel was jealous at her sister,' corresponds to the jealous rivalry which J has introduced between the sisters, (as between Sarah and Hagar, Esau and Jacob, Joseph and his brethren), of which there is no trace in E.

*(v) *v.*1[b], קָנְאָה, 'be jealous at,' (166.xxiv).

*(vi) *v.*1[c], הָבָה, 'give here,' (55.iv).

(vii) *v.*1[d], 'I die,' as in l.24; *comp.* 'behold I die!' xlviii.21, l.5:

$E_2$ has also 'behold thou diest!' xx.3.

(viii) *v.*1, 'Give me children, or I die!' *comp.* Rebekah's impatient exclamation, 'I am weary of my life—for what is my life to me?' xxvii.46.

(ix) *v.*2, 'and Jacob's anger was kindled,' (5.viii).

(x) *v.*2, 'am I instead of Elohim?' as in l.19.

(xi) *v.*2, בֶּטֶן, 'womb,' as in xxv.23, xxxviii.27—also E (xxv.24).

(xii) *v.*6, אָמָה, 'maiden,' as in xxxi.33,—also $E_2$(xx.17, xxi.10,10,12,13): used *nowhere* by E, who employs always (*eleven* times) שִׁפְחָה, as in the whole of this context, *v.*4,7,9,10,12,18.

(xiii) *v.*3, 'go-in unto her . . . and I also shall be built out of her';

*comp.* 'go-in, I pray, unto my maid; perhaps, I shall be built out of her,' xvi.2.

*(xiv) *v.*3, בּוֹא, 'go-in,' used of sexual intercourse (86.iii).

(xv) *v.*3, 'she shall bear upon my knees';

*comp.* 'were born upon Joseph's knees,' l.23.

(*γ*) *v.*4[a], *Elohistic.*

(xvi) *v.*4[a], 'and she gave to him Bilhah her maid for wife';

*comp.* 'and she took Hagar . . . her maid . . . and gave her to Abram her husband to him for wife,' xvi.3;

'and she took Zilpah her maid and gave her to Jacob for wife,' *v.*9.

N.B. 'to him' refers to 'Jacob' in *v.*1[a], which immediately preceded in E.

(*δ*) *v.*4[b], *Jehovistic.*

(xvii) *v.*4[b], 'and Jacob went-in unto her,' refers to *v.*3.

*(xviii) *v.*4ᵇ, בּוֹא, 'go-in,' used of sexual intercourse (86.iii).

N.B. So in xvi.3 E says nothing about Abram's 'going-in' to Hagar; but the E. datum ends there, as it does here, with 'for wife,' as appears above in (γ): *there*, however, follows in xvi.4 just the same kind of J. interpolation, 'and Abram went-in unto her,' as we find here, 'and Jacob went-in unto her.'

### (ε) *v.*5,6ᵃ, *Elohistic.*

(xix) *v.*5, 'and Bilhah conceived and bare *to Jacob* a son';

*comp.* 'and Sarah conceived and bare *to Abraham* a son,' xxi.2.

(xx) *v.*6ᵃ, 'and Rachel said, Elohim hath judged me (דָּנַנִי)'; this is the E. derivation of Dan, consisting of one clause, as in *v.*11,13,18ᵃ,20ᶜ,23, which J tries to make more clear, just as in *v.*18ᵇ, by his addition, 'and hath also heard my voice, and given to me a son,' adding then the conclusion, 'therefore she called his name Dan,' which is in the style of J, but not at all in that of E, *comp.* *v.*8ᶜ,11, 13,18ᶜ,20ᶜ,21,24ᵃ. Thus E's account of the actual naming has here been replaced by J's.

### (ζ) *v.*6ᵇ, *Jehovistic.*

(xxi) *v.*6ᵇ, גַּם, 'also,' (202.vi).

(xxii) *v.*6ᵇ, 'hearken to the voice of,' as in xxvii.8,13,43,—never used by E.

(xxiii) *v.*6ᵇ, 'and hath hearkened unto my voice,' refers to Rachel's cry in *v.*1ᵇ.

(xxiv) *v.*6ᵇ, 'and hath given to me a son';

*comp.* 'and hath given to me this [son] also,' xxix.33; 'give me sons,' xxx.1ᵇ.

(xxv) *v.*6ᵇ, 'therefore (עַל־כֵּן) she called his name Dan,' derivation as in (55.xii).

### (η) *v.*7,8ᵃᶜ, *Elohistic.*

(xxvi) *v.*7, 'and Bilhah, Rachel's maid, conceived again, and bare a second son to Jacob';

*comp.* 'and Zilpah, Leah's maid, bare a second son to Jacob,' *v.*12;
'and Leah conceived again, and bare a sixth son to Jacob,' *v.*19.

(xxvii) *v.*8ᵃᶜ, 'and Rachel said, With wrestlings of Elohim I have wrestled with my sister, and she called his name Naphtali';

here we have the E. derivation of Naphtali (נַפְתָּלִי) from נַפְתּוּלֵי, 'wrestlings,' in one single clause, quite after the manner of that of 'Issachar,' *v.*18ᵃᶜ, 'Zebulun,' *v.*20ᵃᶜ, 'Joseph,' *v.*23ᵇ,24ᵃ.

### (θ) *v.*8ᵇ, *Jehovistic.*

(xxviii) *v.*8ᵇ, 'also I have prevailed,' is a Jehovistic insertion as in the other cases, *v.*6ᵇ,18ᵇ, which betrays itself by גַּם, (202.vi),—also by the *rivalry* implied in the exclamation 'I have beaten her too!' which is the expression of a violent jealousy, and indeed could hardly have been written except to express this bitterness of feeling, inasmuch as Leah had already *four* sons of *her own*, while Rachel had only *two* sons *adopted*,—lastly, by the resemblance to xxxii.28, 'and thou hast prevailed.'

The Elohistic clause, 'I have wrestled mightily with my sister,' does not necessarily express any ill feeling between the sisters, but may refer merely to the

fact of the numbers of her children gradually and *with great difficulty* coming up to that of Leah's.

207. We may now sum up our analysis of xxx.1–24 as follows:

E has *v.*1$^{a}$,4$^{a}$,5,6$^{a}$,7,8$^{ac}$,9–13,17,18$^{ac}$,19,20$^{ac}$,21–24$^{a}$;

J has *v.*1$^{b}$,2,3,4$^{b}$,6$^{b}$,8$^{b}$,14–16,18$^{b}$,20$^{b}$,24$^{b}$.

We have here, then, in E the account of the births and namings of six of the eleven sons of Jacob, and of their sister, Dinah, while that of the seventh son in *v.*6 has been mutilated by the J. insertion. The accounts about the other four in xxix.32–35 are also much modified from their original form; yet we have seen reason for assigning to E the following fragments, *v.*32$^{ab}$, 33$^{ad}$,34$^{a}$,35$^{ad}$—to which may, perhaps, be added also—

'and Laban gave to her Zilpah his maid, to Leah his daughter as maid,' *v.*24;

'and Laban gave to Rachel his daughter Bilhah his maid, to her for maid,' *v.*29—

since Zilpah and Bilhah are referred to afterwards in xxx.4$^{a}$,5, 7,9,10,12, and also in the Elohistic passages, xlvi.18,25. It will be seen that none of the above are covered by the analysis in (196).

208. Here, then, according to our view, occurs the first blank in the Elohistic story, *i.e.* we miss the account of Jacob's reaching Padan-Aram, of his receiving his two wives, and of the etymologies of the names of his first four children. Like the record of Isaac's birth and naming, xxi.2–5, and that of Isaac's marriage and the birth of Esau and Jacob, xxv.20,21$^{b}$,24–26, these matters were probably despatched in a very few lines, in addition to what we have above recovered of the original document.

209. HUPFELD, *p.*44, recognises xxx.22 as *Elohistic*, nay, as being '*quite in the tone and style of the primary document*;' yet he considers that we have only here fragments due to the *Second* Elohist, and glosses by a later hand, while the connection of the narrative must be ascribed to the *Jehovist*. He writes as follows, *p.*43,44:—

The Elohistic origin [*i.e.* from $E_2$] does not hold, however, of all the passages hitherto reckoned to it, which require considerable sifting. In the first place, to

this was supposed to belong all which in the narrative of his residence with Laban bears the name 'Elohim,' which, however, limits itself to the second part of his marriage-history or rather of his marriage-blessing, xxx.1–24, (interspersed with Jehovistic interpolations.) In the meanwhile, the Elohistic origin of this passage is by no means made out certainly to my mind. It is the continuation of the J. marriage-history in xxix, without a trace of a *seam*, written quite on the same historical foundations and assumptions, in the very same manner and style. . . . The only Elohistic sign is the frequent recurrence of the name 'Elohim.' This, however, is in many instances not very strong evidence—(i) in formulæ where this name, if not exclusively, yet is usually and by preference employed, as 'am I instead of Elohim?' *v.*2, 'wrestlings of Elohim,' *v.*8,—(ii) in etymologies of names, *v.*6,8,18,20,23, in which, as in proverbs, the ordinary Divine Name must have been the more usual, and in which also appear, now and then, glosses from other sources or traditions, as in iv.26, v.29; which here, too, are coupled frequently with other double etymologies of the same names, *v.*18,&c. and so are only variations of the Jehovistic, as appears most plainly in *v.*23,24. Not till the latter portion of the story does the name 'Elohim' enter independently into the narrative, and even in an Elohistic formula, *v.*22,—'and Elohim remembered Rachel, and Elohim &c.' like viii.1, xix.29,—and with a *repetition* of the name, which is certainly quite in the tone and style of the primary document, just as in E.ii.24,25. This, however, applies no further than to Elohistic fragments and glosses; while the connection of the narrative itself, in my judgment, can only be ascribed to the Jehovist.

With the last of the above conclusions of HUPFELD we agree, *viz.* that 'the connection of the narrative is Jehovistic.' But we see no indication of a later hand; and we must appeal to the analysis, and especially to the strong evidence afforded by xxx.23, as ground for maintaining that the E. fragments in question are due to the primary Elohist. If *v.*22 is 'quite in his tone and style,'—so that we may fairly assume that he gave an account of the birth and naming of *one* of the sons of Israel, Joseph,—then it is *probable* that he did the same for *all* of them, and the rest of our argument seems of necessity to follow. HUPFELD says also, *p.*188, note—

Perhaps there are also in the preceding account of Jacob's marriage, xxix, some verses to be separated for $E_2$, which notify the marriage simply, (without the deception in the matter of Leah, which in any case is Jehovistic, and perhaps without the preference for Rachel,) and the maids given by Laban to his daughters.

Here also we assign the Elohistic fragments, which we have recovered from xxix, to E, and not to $E_2$.

210. BOEHMER ascribes xxix.2—xxx.24, *wholly* to the Jehovist, except xxx.14–16,20$^{b}$,24$^{b}$, which he gives to the Compiler, and writes as follows, *p.*85 :—

With respect to the double derivations of names in xxx.14–24, HUPFELD recognises Elohistic fragments in those three, [Issachar, Zebulun, Joseph,] which contain the name 'Elohim,' and in all that stands in close connection with them. But E has given the list of names of the sons first in a later place, E.i.1–5, and there, certainly, without any etymological remarks, which list would then have been here anticipated. It seems also that HUPFELD would ascribe these fragments to $E_2$. But this writer [?] also gives the names of the sons of Jacob afterwards, xxxv.23$^{b}$–26, and without etymologies. We have only, therefore, to choose between the Compiler and the Jehovist; and we see no reason for not assigning to the latter the whole passage about Zebulun, xxx.20.

*Ans.* We must appeal again to the evidence above produced. It will be seen that the lists of Jacob's sons in E.i and G.xxxv *both*, in our view, belong to E, just as he gives more than once the names of Noah's three sons, v.32,vi.10, *comp.* vii.13. If E derived their names at all, of course, he would naturally do so *here*, while giving an account of their births. The very fact, indeed, that BOEHMER is obliged to assign such a purely Elohistic passage as xxx.22,23, to the Jehovist, seems to us decisive against his view.

We agree with him mainly in respect of xxix, which he assigns wholly, and we almost wholly, to the Jehovist.

211. HUPFELD remarks as follows in his Preface, *p.*viii,&c. :—

There is only one book, among the more striking literature on this subject, which I must really reproach and condemn myself for not having before compared and consulted. This is no other than the well-known old *Urkunden des Jerusalemer Tempel-Archivs* of ILGEN (Halle, 1798). This book, which I had long ago partly read and made notes from, and had again in its details forgotten, had at the time made the most unfavourable impression upon me from its style, which bore the stamp of the preceding century and of the first wild period of criticism—with that colossal arbitrariness and violence, with which a whole series of Divine Names were altered, especially 'Jehovah' into 'Elohim,' in order to make a second Elohist out of the greater part of our Jehovist, and with constant appeals to the LXX and Sam. Text, the splitting-up of the text, to help the separation of the documents, into the smallest portions, the ungrounded free modernising of the translation, &c. And, in fact, (with the exception of the history of Joseph, especially xxxvii,) it had left behind in me almost only the recollection of an extravagance. When, however, after the printing of the first three articles of my treatise, and before the composition of the last, I was seeking help for the concluding chapter and for some supplementary notes, among other books I also took in hand again the book of ILGEN, and perceived with no small surprise that under the rubbish of violent and manifestly wrong separations of the original documents, which had at that time

so offended me, were concealed, however, many that were excellent or note-worthy, and especially the greater portion of those, which had been (as I supposed) first discovered by myself, and among these many on which I had actually most congratulated myself, or at which I had only arrived after long hesitation. Not only were almost all the passages, which I have vindicated for the Elohist, though standing now in a foreign connection, already here assigned to this writer: but also the distinction of a second Elohist, although generally applied erroneously (especially in assigning to him such purely Jehovistic passages as ii.5–25, iii.1–24, iv.1–26,&c.), was yet in itself properly recognised,—together with many other delicate observations upon the style and manner of the different documents. This discovery brought to me on the one hand, from the complete independence of this coincidence, the most satisfactory confirmation, that could possibly be desired, of my mode of procedure, (as, conversely, to the good old ILGEN, the most splendid compensation and apology); on the other hand it was mixed with the unpleasant feeling of having in some sense *acta egisse*, *i.e.* a sense of having reproduced, and as something new, what had been said subtantially 50 years ago, so that I might incur, perhaps, the suspicion of having wished to dress myself with other men's feathers. As to the latter point, probably, my literary character and the mode of my investigation will sufficiently protect me. And as to the former, there will at least in the worst case —that is, if I had demonstrated nothing else than what had been maintained before by ILGEN—be left to my work the merit of making anew the discovery which had been lost, not for me only, but, as it seems, also for others, and reconquering thus, and I trust securing, this ground to criticism,—which in any case would be a not much less important service than that of the first discovery, and might be under certain circumstances a yet greater and more useful one. Yet I certainly suppose with some confidence that I have not merely reproduced and justified the ideas of ILGEN.

212. I have quoted the above interesting passage at length, (i) because it exhibits so clearly the candour and modesty of the eminent critic who wrote it, (ii) because it illustrates the mode in which, step by step, by the labours of different independent writers, more or less cautious and trustworthy, the results of criticism, in reference to the subject before us, have been gradually obtained, and brought to their present position, (iii) because it expresses so fully in the latter sentences my own feelings, in comparing my own results with those of HUPFELD and BOEHMER. But I do so for another reason also, which makes the above quotation one of special interest at this particular point of our analysis.

213. Having brought to a completion my own account

of the passage, which we have just been considering, xxix.32–xxx.24, containing the births of Jacob's children, with respect to which my view differs, as has been shown, from that both of HUPFELD and BOEHMER, I turned to 'the good old ILGEN,' to see what he had to say upon this part of the narrative: and I find that his view substantially agrees with my own. He gives, for instance, to E, xxix.32$^{ab}$,33$^{ad}$,34$^{a}$,35$^{a}$, xxx.1$^{a}$,4$^{a}$,5,7–13, 17–24$^{a}$, omitting, however, the speeches *altogether* in *v.*8,11,13, 18,20,23, which I omit only *partially*, and assigning to E also the *namings* in xxix.34,35, xxx.6, which I reject, because they are written in the style of the Jehovist, but which he remodels into the style of the Elohist, making use here of that 'arbitrariness and violence' which HUPFELD justly complains of.

214. Upon the whole, therefore, ILGEN'S view is almost identical with my own as regards the Elohistic passages, and he gives also, as I do, xxx.14–16 to the Jehovist, but the rest to $E_2$, doing here (as it seems to me) what HUPFELD also complains of, *viz.* 'making a Second Elohist out of a Jehovist.' Having found, however, this support to my own view, I must leave the evidence, as I have presented it, to the judgment of the reader, though in this case disagreeing for the second time (149) with so good an authority as HUPFELD. And these two points of difference will necessarily occasion some other points of disagreement in the further portion of our work, and will, in some sense, perhaps, be considered to justify them.

215. If, however, our view be correct as to the results of the analysis of this passage, then it seems to us that the phenomena, which we have here before us, are decisive as to the question, whether the *Jehovist* wrote as an independent author or not. If the portions which we have assigned to him—on good grounds, as it seems to us—in xxx, *viz.* *v.*1$^{b}$,2,3,4$^{b}$,6$^{b}$,8$^{b}$,14–16, 18$^{b}$,20$^{b}$,24$^{b}$, are really his, it seems impossible to suppose that these are mere fragments of an independent narrative, inserted here by the Compiler. They have all the *appearance* of being

mere *supplementary notes*, introduced for very obvious reasons, which we have explained in the course of the analysis. And some of them are surely too trivial to have been picked out by the Compiler from the Jehovistic story, and inserted here in the Elohistic. Why, for instance, should the Compiler have been so careful to preserve to us *v.*4$^{b}$, 'and Jacob went-in unto her,' or *v.*6$^{b}$, 'and hath also hearkened unto my voice,' or *v.*18$^{b}$, 'because I have given my maid to my husband'? In short, it seems to us that either these notes are due to the later Compiler himself, for which supposition there is no internal ground whatever, or they combine strongly, with the evidence which we have had before us already, to show that the Jehovist was *not* an independent writer.

216. xxx.25–43, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*25, 'send me away and I will go to my place';
*comp.* 'send me away to my master,' xxiv.54;
'send me away and I will go to my master,' xxiv.56;
'and I should have sent thee away,' xxxi.27;
'thou wouldst have sent me away,' xxxi.42.

(ii) *v.*25, 'and I will go to my place';
*comp.* 'and Abraham returned to his place,' xviii.33;
'and Laban went and returned to his place,' xxxi.55.

(iii) *v.*25, 'my place,' used of native land, *comp.* 'our place,' xxix.26, 'his place,' xxxi.55.

(iv) *v.*25, 'my land,' used of *native* land, as in xxiv.4; *comp.* 'thy land,' xii.1, xxxii.9.

(v) *v.*26, 'for which I have served thee,' 'thou knowest the service with which I have served thee,' *v.*29, 'thou knowest how I have served thee,' referring to xxix. 18,25,27,28.

(vi) *v.*26, עֲבוֹדָה 'service,' as in xxix.27.

*(vii) *v.*27, 'if, I pray, I have found favour in thine eyes,' as in xviii.3, xxxiii.10, xlvii.29, l.4, *comp.* (13.xii).

(viii) *v.*26,29, 'thou (pron.) knowest,' xxx.26,29, xxxi.6, xliv.27, *comp.* xii.11, xxii.12—also $E_2$(xx.6), D(xviii.19).

(ix) *v.*27, 'and Jehovah hath blessed me for the sake of thee';
*comp.* 'and Jehovah blessed the Egyptian's house for the sake of Joseph,' xxxix.5.

(x) *v.*27, בְּגָלָל 'for the sake of,' as in xii.13, xxxix.5.

(xi) *v.*30,43, פָּרַץ 'break-forth,' (186.xii).

(xii) *v.*30, לְרַגְלִי, 'according to the foot of,' as in xxxiii.14,14.

(xiii) *v.*31, 'do this thing,' as in xxxiv.14, *comp.* xix.8, xxii.12, xxxiv.19, xlii.18 xliii.11, xlv.17,19,—also $E_2$(xx.10, xxi.26).

(xiv) *v.*32, 'pass through,' as in xii.6.

*(xv) *v.*32,35, סוּר, 'turn-aside,' (43.v).

(xvi) *v.*35, 'in that day,' (99.lvi).

(xvii) *v.*35, 'give into the hand of,' = place in charge of, as in xxxii.16(17), xxxix.4,8,22, xlii.37, *comp.* xxiv.10, xxxi.39, xxxix.6,23, xlii.37, xliii.9,—also E(ix.2).

(xviii) *v.*35, 'and he gave into the hand of his sons';

*comp.* 'and he gave into the hand of his servants,' xxxii.16.

(xix) *v.*36, יִוָּתֵר, 'be left,' xxx.36, xxxii.24(25), xliv.20; *comp.* xlix.3,3,4.

(xx) *v.*38, הֶאֱיִן, 'set,' xxx.38, xxxiii.15, xliii.9, xlvii.2.

(xxi) *v.*38, לְנֹכַח, 'over-against,' as in xxv.21[a].

*(xxii) *v.*40, בָּדַד, 'separate,' (3.x).

*(xxiii) *v.*40, לְבַד, 'apart,' (3.xiii).

(xxiv) *v.*41,42, קָשַׁר, 'bind,' xxx.41,42, xxxviii.28, xliv.30.

(xxv) *v.*43, מְאֹד מְאֹד, 'exceedingly,' as in vii.19[a].

(xxvi) *v.*43, 'flocks and maids and servants and camels and he-asses,' (59.xxii).

*(xxvii) *v.*43, 'camels,' (59.xxiii).

217. HUPFELD, *p.*43, regards the clause in *v.*40,—

'and he set the face of the flock towards the ring-straked and all the brown in the flock of Laban,'—

as a variation from the representation of the Jehovist in *v.*31–36, because it sets forth the idea of an *undivided* flock of Laban, where the coloured sheep and goats were still left mingled with the white. And BOEHMER, *p.*224, for a similar reason, and because, as he says,—

'an interpolation is implied by the different use of the word כְּשָׂבִים, which there (unless something has been left out) must mean the young cattle generally, both goats and sheep, whereas in *v.*32,33,35, it means sheep only,—

separates the whole of *v.*40 for the Compiler.

Our analysis disproves the latter supposition; and HUPFELD'S suggestion seems to us not to be needed. The lambs, which Jacob separates in *v.*40, are, as we suppose, those which were brought forth before the rods in *v.*39, some of which—but not, of course, *all*, and not *at first*, we may suppose, even *very many* —were 'ringstraked, speckled, and spotted.' These coloured ones were to be Jacob's, though they still formed part of the flock, which, as a whole, was '*Laban's* flock.' But Jacob puts these

in a flock 'by themselves,' not mixing them up with the rest which belonged to Laban, and were 'Laban's flock' in the more strict sense of the word, but setting the coloured ones all together, and keeping them 'before the face of the flock,' *i.e.* at the head of it, so that the ewes had always their eyes upon them. This was meant to increase the effect of the rods; since at all times, wherever they went, the ewes would have the stripes before them.

218. xxxi.1–17, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*1, 'he heard the words of,' as in xxiv.30, xxvii.34, xxxix.19; *comp.* xxiv.52.

(ii) *v.*1, 'all which was our father's,' (59.xxviii).

(iii) *v.*1, עָשָׂה, 'make,' in the sense of 'produce, gain'; *comp.* xi.4, xxx.30, —also $E_2$(xli.47), E(xii.5).

(iv) *v.*1, 'all this glory,' refers to xxx.43; *comp.* 'all my glory,' xlv.13.

*(v) *v.*1, כָּבוֹד, 'glory,' (59.xiv).

*(vi) *v.*2,5, 'see the face of,' xxxi.2,5, xxxii.20, xxxiii.10,10, xliii.3,5, xliv.23,26, xlvi.30, xlviii.11; *comp.* xxxii.30.

(vii) *v.*3, 'And Jehovah said unto Jacob';

*comp.* 'And Jehovah said unto Abram,' xii.1.

*(viii) *v.*3, 'unto the land of thy fathers and to thy kindred,' *v.*13, 'unto the land of thy kindred,' (58.ii).

(ix) *v.*3, 'I will be with (עִם) thee,' *v.*5, 'the Elohim of my father has been with (עִם) me,' (163.x).

(x) *v.*4, 'sent and called,' (180.xlvii).

(xi) *v.*4,14, 'Rachel and Leah'—Rachel put *first*, in accordance with xxix.30.

(xii) *v.*5, 'the Elohim of my (thy, your, their) father,' xxxi.5,29,42,53, xliii.23, xlvi.3, l.17, *comp.* (193.ii).

(xiii) *v.*5, 'the Elohim of my father *has been with me*,' *i.e.* protecting and blessing me, according to the promise in xxviii.13–15, 'I am Jehovah, the Elohim of Abraham thy father and the Elohim of Isaac: . . . and behold *I am with thee*, and will keep thee in all the way in which thou goest &c.'

(xiv) *v.*6, 'ye (pron.) know,' (216.viii).

(xv) *v.*6, 'I have served your father,' refers to xxx.26,29.

(xvi) *v.*7, 'and he has changed my wages ten times,' *v.*8, 'if thus he said, The speckled shall be thy hire, then all the cattle bare speckled; and if thus he said, the ringstraked shall be thy hire, then all the cattle bare ringstraked,' *comp.* *v.*41.

N.B. In xxx.31–43 J has only related the *first* arrangement with Laban, and the manner in which Jacob turned it to account. It may be readily supposed that, in consequence of the result of a year or two's experience, Laban changed the form of the agreement, and more than once in the course of the six years; and these two or three changes may be here exaggerated by Jacob into 'ten times.'

(xvii) *v.*7, 'and he has changed my wages ten times';
*comp.* *v.*41, 'and thou hast changed my wages ten times.'
(xviii) *v.*7, הֶחֱלִיף, 'change,' xxxi.7,41, xxxv.2; *comp.* xli.14, xlv.22,22.
(xix) *v.*7, מַשְׂכֹּרֶת, 'wages,' as in xxix.15.
(xx) *v.*7, 'and Elohim hath not suffered (נָתַן) him to do-evil with me';
*comp.* 'therefore I suffered thee not to touch her,' xx.6($E_2$).

N.B. The 'Elohim' in *v.*7,9, clearly refers to the 'Elohim has been with me' in *v.*5, and this to the 'El of Beth-El,' *v.*13, which carries us back to xxviii.13–22.

*(xxi) *v.*7, הָרַע 'do-evil,' (99.xxi).
(xxii) *v.*7, 'do-evil with (עִם),' as in *v.*29, nowhere else in the Bible;
*comp.* 'do-good with (עִם),' xxxii.9(10),12(13), 'speak from good to evil with,' xxxi.24,29.
(xxiii) *v.*8,8, 'they (*masc.*) bare,' as in *v.*43,—also $E_2$(xx.17).

N.B. In xxx.39 we have 'and they (*fem.*) conceived,' *comp.* (below, xxvi.N.B.).

(xxiv) *v.*8,10,12, 'speckled,' 'ringstraked,' as in xxx.32,33,35,39,40.

N.B. בְּרֻדִּים, 'grisled,' is mentioned in *v.*10,12, but not in xxx.32–40; and 'spotted' and 'brown' are mentioned in xxx.32,33,35,39, but not in xxxi.8,10,12: but this does not seem to imply any difference of the sources. The words all merely express different varieties of coloured sheep.

(xxv) *v.*9,16, הִצִּיל, 'deliver,' xxxi.9,16, xxxii.11(12), xxxvii.21,22, *comp.* xxxii.30(31).

(xxvi) *v.*9, 'your (*masc.*) father,' *comp.* (above, xxiii).

N.B. In *v.*5,6, in the same context, we have 'your (*fem.*) father'; *comp.* (xxiii.N.B.).

(xxvii) *v.*10, יָחַם, 'conceive,' as in xxx.38,39,41,41.

*(xxviii) *v.*10, 'and it came to pass at the time of the flock's conceiving';
*comp.* 'and it came to pass at the time of her travail,' xxxviii.27;
'at the time of evening,' viii.11, xxiv.11;
'according to the time of life,' xviii.10,14;
'the time of women drawing water,' xxiv.11;
'the time of the cattle being gathered,' xxix.7.

*(xxix) *v.*10,12, 'lift up the eyes and see,' (63.xv).
(xxx) *v.*10, 'in a dream,' *comp.* xxviii.12—also $E_2$(xx.3,6).
(xxxi) *v.*11, 'angel of ELOHIM,' (193.iii).
(xxxii) *v.*11, 'and said unto me, Jacob, and I said, Behold me!'
*comp.* 'and said unto him, Abraham, and he said, Behold me!' xxii.1.

*(xxxiii) *v.*12, רְאֵה, 'see,' in the sense of 'behold!' (63.xxi).
(xxxiv) *v.*12, 'all which Laban is doing';
*comp.* 'all which he is doing,' xxxix.3,23; 'all which they are doing,' xxxix.22.
(xxxv) *v.*13, 'I am the El of Beth-El, where thou anointedst a pillar, where thou vowedst a vow to me,' refers to xxviii.18–22.
(xxxvi) *v.*15[a], 'are we not reckoned *to* him,' לְ with a passive verb;
*comp.* 'Jehovah was entreated *to* him,' xxv.21[a].

(xxxvii) *v.*16, 'all which Elohim hath said unto thee, do';
*comp.* 'what he saith to you, do,' xli.55.

N.B. Here also the 'Elohim' refers to Jacob's use of the word in *v.*5,7,9, *i.e.* to the 'El of Beth-El,' *v.*13.

(xxxviii) *v.*17, 'and he lifted-up his children and his wives upon the camels';
*comp.* 'and they lifted-up their corn upon the he-asses,' xlii.26;
'and they lifted-up . . . . their young-ones and their wives in the wagons,' xlvi.5.

(xxxix) *v.*17, קוּם, 'arise' = start, (63.xxv).

*(xl) *v.*17, 'camels,' (59.xxiii).

N.B. *v.*17, as we suppose, is the J. link, intended to introduce the E. *v.*18.

219. xxxi.18, *Elohistic.*

Probably, this verse followed in the original E. document immediately after xxx.24[a], without any intervening account of the extraordinary increase of Jacob's cattle, or of any quarrel between him and Laban. Just as abrupt in xii.4[b],5, it stands,—

'And Abram took Sarai and Lot, and all the gain which they had gotten, and the souls which they had made in Charran, and they went-out to go to the land of Canaan'—

without any previous description of the increase of Abram's wealth. But something appears to be missing here from E, which has been replaced by the more full Jehovistic datum in *v.*17, something corresponding to what we find in xii.5, *e.g.*—

'and *Jacob took his wives and his children,* and he led-off &c.'

*(i) 'and he led-off all his cattle, and all his gain which he had gotten, the cattle of his wealth which he had gotten in Padan-Aram,' (60.v).

(ii) 'Padan-Aram,' (157.v).

(iii) 'to go to Isaac his father in the land of Canaan';
*comp.* 'and Jacob came to Isaac his father,' xxxv.27.

220. xxxi.19–55, *Jehovistic.*

(i) *v.*19, 'and Laban had gone to shear his sheep,' referring to the fact of Laban's *original coloured* sheep having been sent 'in the hand of his sons, three days' journey away,' xxx.36, while Jacob still had charge of the *original white* flock, (in which, however, many coloured sheep had by this time been born), supposed to be kept near the *home-stead,* under Laban's eye.

N.B. This verse connects itself with the Elohistic *v.*18, and shows that the writer is merely *supplementing* the original story.

(ii) *v.*19, 'and Rachel had stolen her father's teraphim,' which she was able to do, because left at home, when the father had gone to his distant flock.

(iii) *v.*19, 'Rachel,' the favourite—apparently of the father, as well as of the husband, *v.*4,14—takes the teraphim.

(iv) *v.*20,24, 'Laban the Aramæan,' copied from the E. phrase in xxv.20,xxviii.5.

*(v) *v.*20,21,22,27, בָּרַח, 'flee' (86.ix).

(vi) *v.*21, כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ, 'all which he had,' (59.xxviii).

N.B. In this verse the phrase 'and he *arose*,' which implies the *beginning* of his movement, betrays the strange hand, which had not already written *v.*18, 'and he led-off &c.'

(vii) *v.*21, קוּם, 'arise,' = start, (63.xxv).

(viii) *v.*21, 'and he arose and crossed-over the river';

*comp.* 'and he arose . . . . and crossed-over the ford,' xxxii.22.

*(ix) *v.*22, 'it was told to Laban,' (137.ii).

(x) *v.*22, 'on the third day,' refers to Laban's being three days' distance from home, xxx.36, xxxi.19.

(xi) *v.*23,25,54, 'his brethren,' *comp.* 'our brethren,' *v.*32, 'my brethren and thy brethren,' *v.*37.

*(xii) *v.*23, דָּבַק, 'cleave,' (3.xix).

(xiii) *v.*24, 'Elohim' is again the 'El of Beth-El,' *v.*13, who is ever '*with*' Jacob, *v.*5, and watching over him, *v.*7,9, according to the *promise*, xxviii.15, (*comp.* especially the words 'I am with thee,' 'I will keep thee in all [the way] that thou goest,' 'I will not leave thee' &c.,) and the *vow*, xxviii.20, 'If Elohim will be with me &c.'

(xiv) *v.*24, 'and Elohim came unto Laban the Aramæan in a dream of the night, and said to him';

*comp.* 'and Elohim came unto Abimelech in a dream of the night, and said to him,' xx.3($E_2$).

(xv) *v.*24,29, הִשָּׁמֶר לְךָ פֶּן, 'take heed to thyself lest,' as in xxiv.6.

(xvi) *v.*24,29, 'speak with (עִם),' as in xxix.9—*nowhere else in Genesis.*

(xvii) *v.*24,29, 'speak with (עִם) him from good unto bad';

*comp.* 'speak unto (אֶל) him evil or good,' xxiv.50.

(xviii) *v.*25, נָשַׂג, 'come-up-with,' xxxi.25, xliv.4,6:

E also has it in xlvii.9.

(xix) *v.*25, 'tent,' as in *v.*33,34.

(xx) *v.*26, 'what hast thou done?' as in iv.10, *comp.* (4.xiii).

N.B. In *v.*26, we have לֵבָב, 'heart,' and in *v.*20, לֵב, —manifestly by the same writer: but the former occurs in Genesis only besides in xx.5,6($E_2$).

(xxi) *v.*26, נָהַג, 'lead-away,' taken up from *v.*18 (E).

*(xxii) *v.*26, חֶרֶב, sword,' (4.xxvi).

(xxiii) *v.*27, חָבָא, 'hide,' iii.8,10.

(xxiv) *v.*27, 'and I should have sent thee away,' *v.*42, 'thou wouldst have sent me away,' (216.i).

*(xxv) *v.*28, 'to kiss my sons and my daughters,' (180.xxv).

(xxvi) *v.*28, עֲשׂוֹ, 'doing,' without an object, *comp.* עָשָׂה, 1.20.

(xxvii) *v.*29, 'do evil,' (171.xxxiv).

(xxviii) *v.*29, 'do evil with (עִם),' (218.xxi).

(xxix) *v.* 29,42,53, 'the Elohim of your (my, their) father,' (218.xii).

N.B. Laban says 'do evil with *you*' (plur.), 'the Elohim of *your* father.'

(xxx) *v.*30, 'thou longedst sore for thy father's house,' refers to 'and I will go to my place and to my land,' xxx.25.

(xxxi) *v.*31, גָּזַל, 'take by force,' as in xxi.25.

(xxxii) *v.*32, 'with (עִם) whom thou findest thy gods, he shall not live';

*comp.* 'with (אֵת) whom of thy servants it shall be found, he shall die,' xliv.9;

'with whom it is found, &c.,' xliv.10,16 17.

*(xxxiii) *v.*32, הִכִּיר, 'discern,' (180.xxiii).

(xxxiv) *v.*33, אָמָה, 'maiden,' as in xxx.3.

(xxxv) *v.*33, Rachel's tent searched *last*—a sign of her being favoured, *v.*4,14.

*(xxxvi) *v.*34, 'camel,' as in *v.*17, (59.xxiii).

(xxxvii) *v.*34,37, מָשַׁשׁ, 'feel,' as in xxvii.12,22.

*(xxxviii) *v.*35, 'let it not be kindled in the eyes of,' as in xlv.5, *nowhere else in the Bible,—comp.* (5.viii).

(xxxix) *v.*35, 'the way of women,' as in xviii.11.

(xl) *v.*35, 'and he searched and found not the teraphim';

*comp.* 'and he searched . . . . and the cup was found,' xliv.12.

*(xli) *v.*36, 'and it was kindled to Jacob,' as in iv.5, *comp.* (5.viii).

(xlii) *v.*36, 'what have I sinned that thou hast &c.';

*comp.* 'what have I sinned against thee that thou hast &c.,' xx.9($E_2$).

(xliii) *v.*36, פֶּשַׁע, 'transgression,' l.17,17.

(xliv) *v.*37,42, הוֹכִיחַ, 'correct, set-right,' (141.xxvi).

(xlv) *v.*38,41, 'these twenty years,' *v.*41, 'I served thee fourteen years for thy two daughters, and six years for thy cattle,' refers to xxix.18,20,27,28, xxx.26–43.

N.B. The six years are not mentioned in the latter passage, but may be well understood as implied in the story.

(xlvi) *v.*39, טְרֵפָה, 'torn-in-pieces,' *comp.* xxxvii.33,33, xliv.28,28, xlix.9,27.

(xlvii) *v.*39, 'from my hand didst thou require it';

*comp.* 'from my hand shalt thou require him,' xliii.9.

(xlviii) *v.*41, 'changed my wages ten times,' as in *v.*7.

(xlix) *v.*42, לוּלֵי, 'unless' as in xliii.10.

(l) *v.*42, 'the Elohim of Abraham and the Dread of Isaac';

*comp.* 'the Elohim of Abraham thy father and the Elohim of Isaac,' xxviii.13.

(li) *v.*42, 'the Elohim of Abraham,' (193.ii).

(lii) *v.*42, 'unless the E. of my father had been with (לִי) me,' see *v.*5, (163.x).

*(liii) *v.*42, עֳנִי, 'affliction,' (86.viii).

(liv) *v.*42, 'my affliction . . . . hath Elohim seen';

*comp.* 'Jehovah hath seen at (בְּ) my affliction'; xxix.32;

'Jehovah hath hearkened unto my affliction,' xvi.11.

N.B. 'The 'Elohim' in this verse still refers to the 'El of Beth-El,' see (218.xiii,xx), (220.xiii).

(lv) *v.*43, 'they (*masc.*) 'bare,' as in *v.*8,8—also $E_2$(xx.17).

(lvi) *v.*44, לְכָה, 'come thou,' as in xxxvii.13.

(lvii) *v.*44, 'cut a covenant,' (126.ii).

(lviii) *v.*44, 'let it be for a witness,' *v.*48, 'this heap is a witness,' *v.*52, 'behold! this heap is a witness, and behold! this pillar is a witness';

*comp.* 'it shall be to me for a witness,' xxi.30.

N.B. The word for 'witness' is עֵד, in xxxi.44,48, עֵדָה, in xxi.30; but *both* are used in xxxi.52.

(lix) *v.*45, 'and he took a stone, and raised it as a pillar';

*comp.* 'and he took the stone . . . . and placed it as a pillar,' xxviii.18.

N.B. The formula is not the same in xxxv.14(E)—

'and he set-up a pillar . . . a pillar of stone.'

(lx) *v.*46, לָקְטוּ, 'gather,' as in xlvii.14.

(lxi) *v.*46, 'and they did eat there upon the heap';

*comp.* 'and they did eat and drink,' xxvi.30, under similar circumstances.

(lxii) *v.*48, 'therefore (עַל־כֵּן) he (one) called its name Galeed (גַּלְעֵד, = heap of witness)'—direct derivation, as in (55.xii).

(lxiii) *v.*49, 'and Mizpah (מִצְפָּה) because he said, Jehovah shall watch (צָפָה) between me and thee,' direct derivation, *comp.* those in (3.xvi).

(lxiv) *v.*49, אֲשֶׁר, 'because,' as in xxx.18.

(lxv) *v.*49, 'we shall be hidden one from (his comrade) the other';

*comp.* 'from thy face I shall be hidden,' iv.14.

(lxvi) *v.*49, 'one from his comrade,' (55.ii).

(lxvii) *v.*50,50,52,52, אִם, 'if . . . not,' as in xxi.23($E_2$), xxvi.29(J).

*(lxviii) *v.*50, עָנָה, 'afflict,' (86.viii).

*(lxix) *v.*50, רְאֵה, 'see,' in the sense of 'Behold!' (63.xxi).

(lxx) *v.*53, 'the Elohim of Abraham and the Elohim of Nahor,' (193.ii);

*comp.* 'the Elohim of Abraham thy father, and the E. of Isaac,' xxviii.13;

'the Elohim of Abraham and the Dread of Isaac,' xxxi.42.

N.B. The expressions in this verse, which imply that Jehovah, 'the Elohim of Abraham,' was also the 'Elohim of Nahor' and the 'Elohim of their father (Terah),' are singularly at variance with the *Deuteronomistic* statements in Joshua, *viz.*:—

'Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood in old time, Terah the father of Abraham and the father of Nahor, and they served *other gods*,' Jo.xxiv.2;

'Put away the gods which your fathers served on the other side of the River, Jo.xxiv.14.

(lxxi) *v.*53, 'Elohim of Abraham . . . shall judge between us';

*comp.* 'Jehovah shall judge between me and thee,' xvi.5.

(lxxii) *v.*53, 'Nahor,' as in xi.29, xxii.20,23, xxiv.10,15,24,47, xxix.5.

(lxxiii) *v.*53, Elohim used with a plur. verb, as in xxxv.7.

(lxxiv) *v.*53, 'and Jacob sware by the Dread of his father Isaac';

*comp.* 'swear by Jehovah, the E. of heaven and the E. of earth,' xxiv.3.

(lxxv) *v.*53, 'the Dread of his father Isaac,' as in *v.*42.

(lxxvi) *v.*54, 'and Jacob sacrificed a sacrifice in the mount';

*comp.* 'and he sacrificed sacrifices to the Elohim of his father Isaac,' xlvi.1.

(lxxvii) *v.*54,54, 'in the mount,' as in *v.*25.
(lxxviii) *v.*54, 'eat bread,' (186.xxxi).
(lxxix) *v.*54, לִין, 'pass-the-night,' (99.viii).
(lxxx) *v.*55, 'rise-early in the morning,' (99.xlix).
(lxxxi) *v.*55. 'and he kissed his daughters,' refers to *v.*28, (180.xxv).
(lxxxii) *v.*55, 'and he blessed them,' *comp.* xlvii.7,10, xlviii.15,20, xlix.28.
(lxxxiii) *v.*55, 'and Laban went and returned to his place';
*comp.* 'and Abraham returned to his place,' xviii.33.
(lxxxiv) *v.*55, 'his place,' *comp.* 'my place,' xxx.25.

221. We have assigned above the whole of xxxi, except *v.*18, to the Jehovist, notwithstanding the fact that the name 'Elohim' is used as a personal name in it *seven* times, *v.*7,9,16,16,24, 42,50. But on very careful and repeated examination we have been unable to detect any decisive signs in this chapter of a difference in authorship, or of a break in the connection. And, as to the name 'Elohim,' it appears to be sufficiently accounted for in all these instances, except *v.*50, by the manifest reference to the 'El of Beth-El,' *v.*13, which carries us back to the promise in xxviii.15,—

'I *am with thee*, and will keep thee in all [the way] in which thou goest, and will return thee to this land; for *I will not leave thee* until that I have done that which I spake of to thee,'—

and to the vow in *v.*20-22,—

'If Elohim will be with me, and will keep me in the way that I go, and will give me bread to eat and raiment to put on, . . . then this stone shall be Beth-El, the House of God.'

And as to *v.*50, 'Elohim is witness between me and thee,' we find so many clear instances (193.i) of the Jehovist using 'Elohim' freely as a personal name in the earlier chapters of Genesis, *e.g.* iv.25,ix.27,xxi.6,xxvii.28,—many of which (194) are admitted by HUPFELD himself to be Jehovistic,—that we find no difficulty in believing that he has put it into the mouth of Laban here.

222. The writer, in short, seems to have had some special interest in the consecration of Bethel, and keeps this place continually in view: and so in xxxii.1,2,10,12, he still refers to

the vision at Bethel, and at last brings Jacob thither again, xxxv.1-7, where Jacob says,—

'Let us arise and go up to Bethel, and I will make there an altar unto the EL, who answered me in the day of my distress, and *was with me in the way which I went*,' *v.*3—

referring evidently again to xxviii.10-22. In fact, while the analysis has shown us very numerous points of agreement with passages admitted to be Jehovistic both by HUPFELD and BOEHMER, there are, if I mistake not, only two phrases in the whole chapter which have occurred each *once* in $E_2$, but not hitherto in J,—*viz.* that in *v.*24, which occurs identically in xx.3($E_2$), (220.xiv), and that in *v.*36, *comp.* with xx.9($E_2$), (220.xlii). For the occurrence of לְבָב in *v.*26, as in xx.5,6($E_2$), (and only there in Genesis,) is balanced by the fact that in the immediate context, *v.*20, and certainly by the *same* author, לֵב is also used; and it is just as reasonable to suppose that J may have used *both*, as to suppose this of $E_2$. In like manner, the use of the *masc.* verb with a *fem.* noun in *v.*8,8,43, as in xx.17($E_2$), is balanced by our observing that in *v.*5,6, the *same* writer (whether $E_2$ or J) has used with a *fem.* noun both a *masc.* and *fem.* pronoun. If $E_2$ may have used both, so also may J; and one single instance of the former exhibiting this peculiarity, as in xx.17, is not enough to secure for this author the exclusive employment of it.

223. We conclude, therefore, upon the whole that xxxi.1-17, 19-53 belongs wholly to the Jehovist, as xxviii.10-22 does, to which it refers so distinctly. And the use of the two phrases above-noticed, both by $E_2$ in xx.3,9, and by J in xxxi.24,36, tends to confirm our conviction that there is no essential difference between these two writers,—that they are one and the same person writing at different times. It might be thought that *v.*3,49, (where 'Jehovah' is used,) were *later* insertions by the same hand which wrote the rest of the section, using only 'Elohim.' But, since this passage refers thoughout to xxviii.10-22, and must

therefore have been written after it, and this latter section employs the name Jehovah, *v.*13,13,16,21, there is no reason why the same author should not have used 'Jehovah' in the above two instances, though he employs only 'Elohim' elsewhere in the Chapter. Indeed, the 'Jehovah' in xxxi.3 seems to refer directly to the promise made by 'Jehovah' in xxviii.13–15, as the 'Elohim' throughout the chapter does to the 'El of Beth-El.' Only it seems not improbable that *v.*48$^{b}$,49, may be a later note, inserted by the author himself in the story which he had already completed, since the place had been already named in *v.*47, and *v.*50 reads like the original continuation of Laban's words in *v.*48$^{a}$.

224. We must now, however, consider what HUPFELD and BOEHMER have to say to this Chapter.

HUPFELD writes as follows, *p.*159 &c.:—

The following history of Jacob in Mesopotamia forms, as we have already seen (209), a long connected passage without any break. First, we have the history of his marriage and increase of wealth, the latter with the help of the cunning which is characteristic of this patriarch in the Jehovistic document, xxix, xxx, with some already-noticed Elohistic glosses upon some of the children's names, which, however, do not disturb the connection. Then follows the story of the return and of the happy triumph over the danger which threatened him from the dreaded vengeance of his injured brother, xxxi.1,3, xxxii.3, xxxiii.17. The triumph over a second danger from another adversary; Laban, is on the contrary the subject of a long *Elohistic* narrative in xxxi. The occasion of this return, and Jehovah's command for it, are mentioned in xxxi.1,3. The account of the following-out of the command, and of the commencement of the journey to Gilead is missed in the Jehovist; and, since it is given at full length in the following Elohistic account of the occasion and circumstances of the journey, *it has either been expelled by this, or is covered up in it.*

225. Thus, then, HUPFELD agrees with us in holding that xxix,xxx, are thoroughly Jehovistic, except some few fragments, which he ascribes to $E_2$, but we to E; and he allows that to the Jehovist we owe xxxi.1,3, and xxxii.3—xxxiii.17. But the main portion of xxxi he gives to $E_2$, without, however, going into a detailed examination of the contents of the Chapter, as we have done above, or showing that it abounds in phrases

peculiar to $E_2$, but apparently founding his judgment chiefly upon the fact that it contains so frequently the name 'Elohim,' and also that—

it contains, in *v.*2,4–12, an E. parallel to the Jehovistic account of the increase of Jacob's cattle in xxx.37–43, which is partly repeated in the rebuke against Laban, *v.*38–41, and varies from the other in representing it all, to the credit of Jacob and discredit of Laban, as the result of the Divine protection against Laban's greed and insincerity. Then is described Jacob's flight with all his property, and his reconciliation with the persecuting Laban—(covenant and oath = contract of peace), —the account of which in xxxi manifestly belongs entirely to the [Second] Elohist, yet must contain in itself a Jehovistic parallel, the traces of which are most clearly discernible at the beginning and end, but also in the rest of the main portion of the story betrays itself here and there; though in any case it cannot without great refinement be separated here, for which this is not the place.

226. But then HUPFELD adds, *p.*160, note :—

Yet in xxxi there appear traces of Jehovistic intermediate links.

(i) *v.*21, 'and he fled, he and all that was his, and he arose and crossed-over the River, and directed his face towards the mountain of Gilead.'

(α) This datum is here superfluous, and is repeated between the two Elohistic verses *v.*20, 'and he deceived Laban inasmuch as he had not *told* him that he *fled*,' and *v.*22, 'and it was told Laban on the third day that Jacob had *fled*,' where the connection and reference to one another of these two verses is in some sense destroyed by this clause.

(β) *v.*21, 'all that was his,' is the usual short expression of the Jehovist for 'property,' when it is not more closely defined, *e.g.* xii.20, xiii.1, xix.12, xxiv.2,36, &c. and does not occur with E, (who has for this purpose more circumstantial and distinct expressions,) or with $E_2$, except the doubtful cases xlv.10,11, xlvi.1,32, xlvii.1, [but? xx.7]; and so in the older passage, xiv, adopted by the Jehovist, we have continually 'all the *property*' or 'the *property*,' *v.*11,16,21.

(ii) *v.*23, 'and he pursued after him seven days' journey, and overtook him on the mount Gilead,' where the 'seven days' are a usual number with the Jehovist, and the overtaking on mount Gilead forms a repetition with *v.*25,—which verse, however, must *precede* the divine appearance in *v.*24, since this last, according to *v.*29,42, did not take place until he got there.

(iii) *v.*44–55, besides the Jehovistic etymology in *v.*49, betrays throughout in the duplication of the main event,—the oath and its contents, the appeal to God, the heap of stones, and its etymology, and the covenant-feast,—the part which the Jehovist has had in it, to whom, perhaps, may belong *v.*45 (מצבה, to which the מצפה in *v.*49 must refer)—perhaps, also *v.*46ᵃ 'heap,' and *v.*47,—also *v.*51,52,—and *v.*53,54, with the etymologies, *v.*48ᵇ,49,—and *v.*55.

227. It will be seen that HUPFELD gives to J. (probably) *v.*1,3,21,23,45–55, except *v.*46$^{b}$,48$^{a}$,50, which last fragments he supposes to belong to $E_2$, running as follows :—

'And they ate there upon the heap. And Laban said, This heap is a witness between me and thee this day, that thou shalt not afflict my daughters, and that thou shalt not take wives upon my daughters; no-one is with us; see, Elohim is witness between me and thee.'

We also think it probable (223) that *v.*48$^{a}$,50, may have been originally connected, and have been separated by a later insertion of the Jehovist. But, if *v.*46$^{b}$,48$^{a}$,50, belongs to $E_2$, as HUPFELD supposes, then *something* of $E_2$ must have been omitted, about the heap, *before* *v.*46$^{b}$. It seems to us that *v.*46$^{a}$, 'his brethren,' is part of the same context with *v.*46$^{b}$, and carries us back to *v.*37, 'my brethren and thy brethren,' and to *v.*32, 'our brethren,' and to *v.*25, 'his brethren,' and also to *v.*23,54, where the same formula occurs, both which latter verses HUPFELD allows to J; and in *v.*50, as our analysis shows, (220.lxviii,lxix) we have עָנָה, 'afflict,' and רְאֵה, 'see,' which are thoroughly Jehovistic formulæ.

228. And, when we look at HUPFELD'S reasons for maintaining that *v.*21,23, give signs of the mixture of two different stories, they do not appear to us convincing.

(i) *v.*21 does not seem to us to be superfluous, except as in some sense repeating the statement of the original Elohist in *v.*18, that 'Jacob led-away &c.'; but this was rendered necessary by the new character which J wished to give to his departure,—that of a sly, underhand, movement in Laban's absence—whereas E had merely spoken of an ordinary removal. Nor does it seem to interrupt the connection between *v.*20 and *v.*22. Rather, the use of בָּרַח, 'flee,'—a thoroughly Jehovistic word (86.ix)—in all these verses, *v.*20,21,22, seems to *clamp* them all together as due to the same author, and that author, the Jehovist,—to whom for this reason, among others, we give also *v.*21, though the argument of HUPFELD in (β) is not conclusive, since the phrase in question occurs in xx.7($E_2$).

(ii) *v.*23 does not seem to us to be repeated in *v.*25: in *v.*23 Laban '*came-close* to Jacob on the mount Gilead,' the word being הִדְבִּיק, as in Ju.xviii.22, 1S.xiv.22, xxxi.2, 2S.i.6; and in *v.*25, Laban '*comes-up with*' him the word being נָשַׂג, as in xliv.4, xlvii.9, E.xiv.9, xv.9, 2K.xxv.5: *comp.* especially Ju.xviii.22,23, 'and they

*came-close to* the children of Dan, and *they cried unto the children of Dan*, and they [the children of Dan] *turned their faces* [to look back], &c.' and G.xliv.4, 'follow after the men, and when thou dost *come-up with* them, &c.' E.xiv.9, 'the Egyptians pursued after them, . . . and *came-up with* them encamping by the sea,' E.xv.9, 'the enemy said, I will pursue, I will *come-up with*,' 2K.xxv.5, 'and the army of the Chaldees pursued after the King, and *came-up with* him in the plains of Jericho.'

In the case before us we have *three* words used—*v.*23, 'pursue after,' 'come-close to,' *v.*25, 'come-up with.' As I understand it, Laban 'came-close to' Jacob on the seventh evening, *v.*23, had the vision on that night, *v.*24, and on the next day 'came-up with' him, *v.*25, and pitched his tent near him: so that there is no occasion to suppose (with HUPFELD) a transposition of the verses.

229. Nor does it seem necessary to conjecture, with him (224), that the *Jehovistic* account of Jacob's return to Canaan has been almost entirely left out, except the few verses quoted above—'either expelled by the Elohistic, or covered up in it.' Nor does it appear to me that there is any inconsistency in supposing that one and the same author wrote the two accounts of Jacob's increase of wealth, in xxxi.7–12 and xxx.37–43. Jacob, of course, ascribes his success to God's blessing upon the means he had used—not to his own cunning: he, who according to this writer, had deliberately lied to his father, xxvii.24, would not hesitate to represent the matter thus. So he is afterwards described by him as craftily misleading Esau with respect to his purpose of visiting him, xxxiii.14. Upon the whole, therefore, we cannot resist the force of the evidence which is given by our analysis; and we assign xxxi, as well as xxix,xxx, on one side of it, and xxxii,xxxiii, on the other, entirely to the Jehovist, except the fragments due to E in xxix,xxx,xxxi. It will be seen that, as regards the share of the Jehovist in xxx–xxxiii, our view is almost identically the same as HUPFELD's.

230. BOEHMER, *p.*85, &c. 113,225, &c. gives much to J, which HUPFELD gives to $E_2$, and *vice versâ*; and he assigns not a little to the later Compiler, who is also supposed to have struck out clauses, which '*must*' have occurred in *each* of the two older documents, *e.g.* 'and Laban said unto Jacob,' *v.*26, 'and Jacob answered and said unto Laban,' *v.*31, 'and Laban answered and

said unto Jacob,' *v.*43.* It appears to us that the constant striving to obtain for each of $E_2$ and J a complete independent narrative has greatly distracted at times the judgment of this able critic. Having careful considered all his remarks, I must still adhere to the opinion expressed above.

231. xxxii.1(2),2(3), *Jehovist.*

*(i) *v.*1(2), 'and Jacob went on his way,' (99.xii).

(ii) *v.*1(2), פָּגַע, 'meet,' as in xxviii.11—also E(xxiii.8).

(iii) *v.*1(2), 'angels of Elohim,' as in xxviii.12.

N.B. We have still the watchful care of the 'El of Beth-El,' (221).

(iv) *v.*2(3), 'as he saw,' as in xxix.10.

(v) *v.*2(3), 'the Camp of Elohim is this!' *comp.* the similar cry in xxviii.17, 'this is none other but the House of Elohim!'

(vi) *v.*2(3), the name Mahanaim (מַחֲנָיִם = 'two camps') derived, (3.iv).

(vii) *v.*2(3), מַחֲנֶה, 'camp,' xxxii.2(3),7(8),8(9),10(11),21(22), xxxiii.8, l.9.

232. BOEHMER gives the above to $E_2$, though HUPFELD, *p.*183, speaks doubtfully as to its Elohistic origin. The former writes as follows, *p.*113, quoting also the words of the latter:—

The Elohistic origin of *v.*1,2, is 'not free from doubt' for HUPFELD, "notwithstanding the Elohim in *v.*1, since this seems to be required by the 'Camp of Elohim' in *v.*2.' We would call to mind that only one other instance occurs in Genesis of such an apparition of a number of angels, *viz.* in xxviii.12, and there also we have פָּגַע, *v.*11, as here, *v.*1; and compare with Jacob's cry in *v.*2 that in xxviii.17, both being used with a view to naming the place.

*Ans.* All BOEHMER's arguments, of course, concur in leading us to the conclusion that these verses belong to J, to whom we give the whole story in xxviii. 10–22, which BOEHMER gives to $E_2$ and the Compiler. But HUPFELD's 'doubt' as to this verse being Elohistic may also shake our confidence in *his* conclusion that xxviii.10–12,17,18,20–22, belongs to $E_2$, and only *v.*13–16,19, to J.

233. xxxii.3(4)–12(13), *Jehovist.*

*(i) *v.*3(4) expresses Jacob's extreme dread of Esau, though after twenty years' absence, in accordance with the Jehovistic account in xxvii.41–45.

---

* In fact, if we add to HUPFELD's list of J. passages (227) the additional verses assigned by BOEHMER to the Jehovist, (though he drops some of HUPFELD's) and those assigned by him to the Compiler (and therefore *not* to $E_2$), we shall have the following list of verses *not* given to $E_2$ by *one* or *both* of these two critics—*v.*1,3,10,12,17,21–23,25–27,30,32–37,43,45,47,49–55, and parts of *v.*11,19,41,44,46, 48—which does not differ very much from our own list, *v.*1–17,19–55.

(ii) *v.*4(5), 'thus shall ye say to my lord to Esau, Thus saith thy servant Jacob';

*comp.* 'go-up unto my father and say unto him, Thus saith thy son Joseph,' xlv.9.

*(iii) *v.*4(5), 'thy servant,' (97.x).

(iv) *v.*4(5), אָחַר, 'delay,' (141.lix).

(v) *v.*5(6), 'oxen and he-asses, flocks and servants, and maids,' (59.xxii).

*(vi) *v.*5(6), 'find favour in thine eyes,' (13.xii).

*(vii) *v.*6(7), 'come to meet,' (97.vii).

(viii) *v.*7(8), 'he was distressed,' *comp.* xxxv.3, xlii.21,21.

(ix) *v.*7(8), 'the people that was with him';

*comp.* 'the people that are with me,' xxxiii.15;

'all the people that were with him,' xxxv.6.

*(x) *v.*7(8),8(9),10(11), מַחֲנֶה, 'camp,' (231.vii).

(xi) *v.*7(8), 'flocks and herds and camels,' (59.xxii).

(xii) *v.*7(8),10(11), '*two camps*'—another allusion to the name 'Mahanaim,' (3.iv).

(xiii) *v.*8(9),11(12), הַכֵּה, 'smite,' (5.xxi).

(xiv) *v.*9(10)–12(13), compare this prayer with that in xxiv.12–14,42–44.

(xv) *v.*9(10), 'the Elohim of my father Abraham and the Elohim of my father Isaac, Jehovah,' (193.ii);

*comp.* 'Jehovah, the Elohim of Abraham thy father and the Elohim of Isaac,' xxviii.13.

N.B. In both passages, xxviii.13, xxxii.9, *Abraham* is called the *father* of *Jacob*.

(xvi) *v.*9(10), 'Jehovah, who saidst unto me, Return to thy land and to thy kindred';

*comp.* 'and Jehovah said unto Jacob, Return unto the land of thy fathers and to thy kindred,' xxxi.3.

(xvii) *v.*9(10), 'thy land,' used of *native* land, (216.iv).

*(xviii) *v.*9(10), 'to thy land and to thy kindred,' (58.ii).

(xix) *v.*9(10),12(13), 'I will do good with (עִם) thee,' 'I will surely do good with thee,' refers to xxviii.13–15, (218.xxii).

*(xx) *v.*10(11), קָטֹן מִן, 'be less than,' (5.xviii).

(xxi) *v.*10(11), 'do mercy with (אֶת),' (141.lv).

*(xxii) *v.*10(11), 'mercies and truth,' (141.xliii).

*(xxiii) *v.*10(11), 'Thy servant,' *comp.* xxiv.14, xxvi.24, (97.x).

*(xxiv) *v.*11(12), הַצִּיל, 'deliver,' (218.xxv).

*(xxv) *v.*11(12), 'deliver me out of the hand of my brother, out of the hand of Esau,' (5.xv).

(xxvi) *v.*11(12), 'I (pron.) fear,' *comp.* xxii.12, xlii.18.

(xxvii) *v.*12(13), '*I will place thy seed* as the sand of the sea';

*comp.* '*I will place thy seed* as the dust of the earth,' xiii.16.

(xxviii) *v.*12(13), 'as the sand of the sea which cannot be numbered for multitude';

*comp.* 'as the sand of the sea very much, until he left-off to number, for there was no number,' xli.49.

234. BOEHMER gives *v.*7(8)–12(13) to the Compiler, but writes as follows, *p.*229:—

At first sight, there is much which seems to speak for assigning this passage, as well as the context before and after, to the Jehovist, to whom HUPFELD leaves it without a word, as he leaves all that follows in the chapter.

But his only valid argument is drawn from *v.*12:

The promise, to which *v.*12 refers, of the seed as numerous as the *sand of the sea*, is only found in xxii.17, an editorial addition. Further, *that* promise was not given to Jacob himself,—(to him was promised a seed as *the dust of the earth*, xxviii.14),—but he must take over to himself the divine declaration addressed to Abraham. Again, we have here 'shall not be counted for multitude,' as in xvi.10, also by the Compiler.

*Ans.* We cannot doubt, from the evidence above produced, that *v.*3–12 belongs wholly to J, as HUPFELD concludes; and to J also we give (with HUPFELD) xvi.10.

235. xxxii.13(14)–22(23), *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*13(14), 'and he passed-the-night there,' as in xxviii.11.

*(ii) *v.*13(14),21(22), לִין, 'pass-the-night,' (99.viii).

(iii) *v.*13(14),21(22),22(23), 'in that night,' (99.lvi).

*(iv) *v.*13(14), &c. מִנְחָה, 'offering,' (5.vii).

(v) *v.*14(15), תַּיִשׁ, 'he-goat,' as in xxx.35.

*(vi) *v.*15(16), 'camels,' (59.xxiii).

(vii) *v.*16(17), 'and he gave into the hand of his servants';

*comp.* 'and he gave into the hand of his sons,' xxx.35.

(viii) *v.*16(17), 'give into the hand of,' (216.xvii).

*(ix) *v.*16(17), לְבַד, 'apart,' (3.xiii).

(x) *v.*16(17), 'pass-over before my face,' *v.*22(23), 'and the present passed-over before his face';

*comp.* 'he passed-over before their face,' xxxiii.3.

'let my lord pass-over before the face of thy servant,' xxxiii.14.

*(xi) *v.*18(19),20(21), 'thy servant,' (97.x).

*(xii) *v.*19(20), 'according to this thing,' (97.xxxix).

*(xiii) *v.*20(21), 'see the face of,' (218.vi).

*(xiv) *v.*20(21), אוּלַי, 'perhaps,' (86.ii).

*(xv) *v.*20(21), 'lift-up (נָשָׂא) the face,' as in xix.21, *comp.* (5.xix).

*(xvi) *v.*21(22), מַחֲנֶה, 'camp,' (231.vii).

(xvii) *v.*22(23), 'and he arose . . . and crossed-over the ford':

*comp.* 'and he arose and crossed-over the river,' xxxi.21.

(xviii) *v.*22(23), קוּם, 'arise' = start, (63.xxv).

N.B. Nothing is here said about *Dinah*; only 'his *eleven sons*' are mentioned, perhaps as most worthy: see (255.(7)).

236. HUPFELD assigns the above, as we do, to the Jehovist, and so also does BOEHMER, except *v.*13[a],22[ac], which he gives to $E_2$, *p.*114, and *v.*21[b],22[b], which he gives to the Compiler, as follows, *p.*230:—

According to the order of the story, as it now stands, Jacob had sent-off the present for his brother in the morning after the night which he spent in Mahanaim. On the evening of the same day he is at the Jabbok, where he again spends the night, in the hinder one of the two camps which he had formed according to the *Compiler* in *v.*8. Also 'in that night' speaks for the *Compiler*, who has it in xix.35, and in *v.*13 of this chapter it must also be an addition of his; *comp.* also xix.33, xxx.16, and xxxii.22—all by the *Compiler*.

*Ans.* The passages to which BOEHMER refers, are all due to the Jehovist. Jacob lodged that night 'in the Camp,'—*i.e.* in the main body, comprising the 'two camps' in *v.*8, which were still kept together.

237. xxxii.23(24)–32(33), *Jehovist.*

The idea seems to have been that Jacob slept that night in the Camp, but rose very early—'in that night,' *v.*22, before it was yet day, *v.*24—and passed his family and flocks across, *v.*22,23, and so was left alone on the other side of the ford, *v.*24. The statement, 'he crossed over,' *v.*22, may refer to his taking his wives and children over, after which he returned to send over his cattle. But see on this point (293) in the Text.

(i) *v.*23(24), אֲשֶׁר לוֹ, 'that which was his,' (59.xxviii).

*(ii) *v.*24(25), יִוָּתֵר, 'be left,' (216.xix).

*(iii) *v.*24(25), לְבַד, 'apart,' (3.xiii).

N.B. In *v.*24(25),25(26), אָבַק, 'wrestle,' is perhaps introduced with reference to the name Jabbok (יַבֹּק), which may have suggested this whole singular story. There is also, probably, in this narrative an allusion to the name 'Jacob' (יַעֲקֹב = 'he trips up').

*(iv) *v.*25(26),32(33), נָגַע, 'touch,' (4.vi).

(v) *v.*26(27),28(29), כִּי אִם, 'except,' (186.xxiii).

(vi) *v.*28(29), the name 'Israel' (יִשְׂרָאֵל) derived from שָׂרָה (עִם) אֵל, 'be a prince with El,' (3.iv).

N.B. This verse seems to be referred to in Hos.xii.3(4).

(vii) *v.*28(29), 'and thou hast prevailed'; *comp.* 'I have prevailed too,' xxx.8.

(viii) *v.*30(31), the name 'Peniel' (פְּנִיאֵל) derived from פְּנֵי אֵל, 'the face of El,' as in (3.xvi).

*(ix) *v.*30(31), 'I have seen Elohim face unto face,' (218.vi).

(x) *v.*30(31), 'I have seen Elohim face unto face, and my soul is delivered'; *comp.* 'Have I seen (=lived) after my seeing (Elohim)?' xvi.13;

'I have seen thy face like seeing the face of Elohim, and thou wast pleased with me,' xxxiii.10.

*(xi) *v.*30(31), 'be delivered,' (218.xxv).

(xii) *v.*30(31), 'my soul,' (59.xxi).

N.B. The 'Elohim' in *v.*28,30, is plainly due to the derivations of 'Israel' and 'Peniel.'

(xiii) *v.*32(33), עַל־כֵּן, 'therefore,' (3.xvii).

*(xiv) *v.*32(33), 'unto this day,' (99.lviii).

BOEHMER, *p.*231, gives to the Compiler *v.*21$^{b}$, *v.*22$^{b}$, 'and he took his two wives, and his two maids, and his eleven sons,' *v.*23, and *v.*24$^{a}$, 'and Jacob was left by himself,' *v.*25, *v.*31, 'and he halted upon his thigh,' and *v.*32. And he assigns the rest of this section to $E_2$. HUPFELD gives the whole, as we do, to J.

## 238. xxxiii.1–17, *Jehovist.*

*(i) We have here again Jacob's dread of Esau, referring to xxvii.41–45.

*(ii) *v.*1,5, 'lift up the eyes and see,' (63.xv).

(iii) *v.*1, 'Esau came and with him 400 men,' refers to xxxii.6.

(iv) *v.*1, חָצָה, 'divide,' as in xxxii.7(8).

(v) *v.*2,7, Rachel still the favoured one, kept furthest away from the danger *comp.* xxix.30, xxxi.4,14,33.

(vi) *v.*3, 'he passed-over before their face,' *v.*14, 'let my lord pass-over before the face of thy servant,' (237.x).

*(vii) *v.*3, 'bow to the earth,' (97.ix).

*(viii) *v.*3,6,7,7, נָגַשׁ, 'come-near,' (97.xxxii).

*(ix) *v.*4, 'ran to meet,' (97.vii).

(x) *v.*4, 'he ran to meet him and embraced him and kissed him,' as in xxix.13; *comp.* 'he kissed them and embraced them,' xlviii.10.

*(xi) *v.*4, 'and he fell upon his neck, and kissed him, and they wept';

*comp.* 'and he fell upon his brother Benjamin's neck, and wept, and Benjamin wept upon his neck, and he kissed all his brothers, and wept upon them,' xlv.14,15;

'and he fell upon his neck, and wept upon his neck,' xlvi.29;

'and he fell upon his father's face, and wept upon him and kissed him,' l.1.

*(xii) *v.*4, 'and he kissed him,' (180.xxv).

*(xiii) *v.*4, בָּכָה, 'weep,' (180.xli).

(xiv) *v.*5, 'what are these of thine?' *v.*8, 'what is all this camp of thine that I met?' *comp.* xxi.29.

(xv) *v.*5,11, 'Elohim hath granted to thy servant';

*comp.* 'Elohim grant to thee,' xliii.29.

*(xvi) *v.5*, 'thy servant,' *v.14*, 'his servant,' (97.x).

*(xvii) *v.8*, מַחֲנֶה, 'camp,' (231.vii).

(xviii) *v.8*, פָּגַשׁ, 'meet,' as in xxxii.17(18).

*(xix) *v.8,10,15*, 'find favour in the eyes of,' (13.xii).

(xx) *v.9*, אֲשֶׁר־לְךָ, 'what is thine,' (59.xxviii).

*(xxi) *v.10*, אַל־נָא, 'let not, I pray,' (63.xii).

*(xxii) *v.10*, 'if, I pray, I have found favour in thine eyes,' (97.xi, 13.xii).

*(xxiii) *v.10*, מִנְחָה, 'present,' (5.vii).

*(xxiv) *v.10*, 'take out of the hand of,' (5.xv).

(xxv) *v.10*, כִּי עַל־כֵּן, 'for therefore,' as in xviii.5, (3.xvii).

*(xxvi) *v.10,10*, 'see the face of,' (218.vi).

N.B. There is probably an allusion in 'seeing Esau's face as the *face of Elohim*' to the name of 'Peniel,' at which place this meeting is supposed to have occurred.

(xxvii) *v.11*, יֶשׁ־לִי־כֹל, 'all is mine,' = I have all that I desire, *comp.*(59.xxviii).

(xxviii) *v.11*, פָּצַר בְּ־, 'press on,' as in xix.3,9,—*nowhere else in the Pentateuch.*

(xxix) *v.13*, 'flocks and herds,' (59.xxii).

*(xxx) *v.13*, וָמֵתוּ, 'then they shall die,' (99.xli).

(xxxi) *v.14,14*, 'according to the foot of,' as in xxx.30.

(xxxii) *v.14*, 'until I come unto my lord to Seir,' *v.16*, 'and Esau returned on his way to Seir,' refers to xxxii.3.

*(xxxiii) *v.15*, הִצִּיג, 'set,' (216.xx).

(xxxiv) *v.15*, 'the people that are with me,' (233.ix).

(xxxv) *v.15*, לָמָּה זֶּה, 'wherefore this,' (161.v).

(xxxvi) *v.16*, 'in that day,' (99.lvi).

*(xxxvii) *v.16*, 'and Esau returned on his way,' (99.xii).

*(xxxviii) *v.17*, 'therefore (עַל־כֵּן) he called the name of the place Succoth'—the name Succoth (סֻכּוֹת = 'booths') derived as in (55.xii).

The above passage certainly belongs to the Jehovist, as both HUPFELD and BOEHMER have decided, (except that the latter gives *v.17* to the Compiler); and yet he uses 'Elohim' *thrice*, *v.5,10,11*: and it is doubtful if he makes any reference in *v.5,11*, to the 'El of Beth-El,' and certainly he does not in *v.10*.

## 239. xxxiii.18–20, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.18*, 'and Jacob came *in peace* to the city of Shechem which is in the land of Canaan, at his coming from Padan-Aram,' refers to the words of J in xxviii.21, 'and I come to my father's house *in peace*'; Jacob has now crossed the Jordan again, and been brought *thus far* happily.

(ii) *v.18*, 'in peace,' *comp.* (186.xxxiii).

(iii) *v.18*, 'to the city of Shechem,' prepares for the story of Shechem and Dinah in xxxiv, which is narrated at length by this writer.

(iv) *v.*18, 'Padan-Aram,' here used by the Jehovist, as well as 'Charran,' xxvii.43, xxviii.10, or 'Aram-Naharaim,' xxiv.10; J takes up here, in fact, the language of E in xxxi.18, to which he is expressly now referring.

(v) *v.*18, אֶת־פְּנֵי, 'in front of,' as in xix.13, xxvii.30.

(vi) *v.*18, 'encamped,' as in xxvi.17.

(vii) *v.*19, קָנָה, 'buy,' as in xxv.10, xlix.30, l.13.

*(viii) *v.*19, 'buy out of the hand of,' as in xxxix.1, *comp.* (5.xv).

*(ix) *v.*19, 'pitch-tent,' (59.ix).

*(x) *v.*19, נָטָה, 'extend,' (59.x).

(xi) *v.*19, מֵאָה, 'hundred,' (13.v).

N.B. This verse is quoted in Jo.xxiv.32. The purchase of this piece of land to receive Joseph's bones is a J. parallel to the E. purchase of the cave at Hebron, where Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were buried.

(xii) *v.*20 refers to the name 'Israel' in xxxii.28.

*(xiii) *v.*20, 'he set-up an altar,' (45.ii).

(xiv) *v.*20, הֲקִימוֹ, 'set-up,' *comp.* (97.v).

(xv) *v.*20, 'and he set-up there an altar, and he called it El the Elohim of Israel';

*comp.* 'and he built there an altar, and he called the place El of Bethel,' xxxv.7.

240. HUPFELD assigns *v.*18[a] to $E_2$, writing as follows, *p.*109:—

*v.*19,20, fall to the Jehovist, and only *v.*18 to our Elohist ($E_2$), to whom at all events *v.*18[a] is secured by all its expressions—not only 'at his coming from Padan-Aram,' but also 'which is in the land of Canaan,' and 'Jacob came,' as in xxxv.6, and 'in peace,' as the fulfilment of the vow in xxviii.21; whereas *v.*18[b], 'and he encamped in front of the town,' is a detail which would better connect itself with what follows, and belongs to the Jehovist.

*Ans.* We give to J xxxv.6, containing 'and Jacob came,' 'which is in the land of Canaan'; and it does not follow, because this writer has *once* used 'Aram-Naharaim,' that he should never use 'Padan-Aram,' especially if (as we suppose) he was only supplementing the E. story, and had its language before him in xxxi.18, xxxv.9. There can be little doubt—see (v) above—that *v.*18[b] does belong, as HUPFELD says, to the Jehovist; and, if so, it is surely most probable that *v.*18[a] belongs to him also.

BOEHMER agrees with us in giving none of this chapter to $E_2$; but he assigns to the *Compiler* *v.*17,19, and part of *v.*18, 'which is in the land of Canaan,—at his coming from Padan-Aram,' as it seems to us, for insufficient reasons.

241. xxxiv.1–31, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*1, 'Dinah, the daughter of Leah,' refers to xxx.21(E).

(ii) *v.*1, 'which she bare to Jacob,' as in xli.50,—also $E_2$(xxi.9), E(xxi.3).

(iii) *v.*1, "daughters of the land,' as in xxvii.46.

(iv) *v.*2, נָשִׂיא, 'prince,' is only used elsewhere in Genesis by E, xvii.20,xxiii.6, xxv.16; but it occurs in other parts of the Pentateuch which are certainly *not* due to the Elohist, *e.g.* E.xxxiv.31,—see KUENEN, *Eng. Ed.* (97).

*(v) *v.*2,7, שָׁכַב אֶת, 'lie with,' (99.lv).

*(vi) *v.*2, עָנָה, 'afflict,' (86.viii).

*(vii) *v.*3, דָּבַק בְּ, 'cleave to,' as in ii.24, *comp.* (3.xix).

(viii) *v.*3,8, 'his soul,' (59.xxi).

(ix) *v.*3, 'speak upon the heart of' = speak kindly to, as in l.21.

*(x) *v.*4, 'take for me this girl for wife,' (120).

(xi) *v.*5, הֶחֱרִישׁ, 'keep silence,' as in xxiv.21.

*(xii) *v.*6,8, 'speak with (אֶת)' as in xlii.7,30, xlv.15—also E(95.xi).

*(xiii) *v.*7, 'at their hearing,' (141.xlvi).

*(xiv) *v.*7, 'be pained,' as in vi.6,(4.xvii).

(xv) *v.*7, 'it was kindled greatly to them,' as in iv.5, *comp.* (5.viii).

(xvi) *v.*7, 'so it is not done'; *comp.* 'it is not done so in our place,' xxix.26: $E_2$ has 'deeds which are not done,' xx.9.

N.B. Strictly speaking, the name 'Israel' could only have properly been used here by the *Jehovist*; since he only has as yet introduced that name into the story, xxxii.28, xxxiii.20.

(xvii) *v.*10, 'the land shall be before you,' *v.*21, 'the land is broad on both hands before them,' (63.xiii).

(xviii) *v.*10,21, 'and ye (they) shall traffic in it';

*comp.* 'and ye shall traffic in the land,' xlii.34.

(xix) *v.*10, 'and get-possessions in it';

*comp.* 'and they got-possessions in it,' xlvii.27*.

*(xx) *v.*11, 'find favour in the eyes of,' (13.xii).

(xxi) *v.*13, 'with subtlety,' as in xxvii.35.

(xxii) *v.*13,27, אֲשֶׁר, 'because,' as in xxx.18, xxxi.49.

(xxiii) *v.*14, 'do this thing,' *v.*19, 'do the thing,' (216.xiii).

*(xxiv) *v.*17, אִם־לֹא, 'if not,' (97.xxx).

(xxv) *v.*18, 'good in the eyes of,' (86.vii).

(xxvi) *v.*19, אָחַר, 'delay,' (141.lix).

*(xxvii) *v.*19, כָּבֵד, 'be heavy,' (59.xiv).

(xxviii) *v.*20,24,24, 'gate of their (his) city,' *comp.* 'gate of Sodom,' xix.1.

N.B. This phrase seems to show that in xxxiii.18 it should be translated 'city of Shechem,' not 'city Shechem,' as BOEHMER supposes.

(xxix) *v.*21, שָׁלֵם, 'peaceful,' as in xxxiii.18.

(xxx) *v.*24, 'men of their city,' *comp.* 'men of the city,' xix.4, xxiv.13, 'men of the place,' xxvi.7,7, xxix.22, xxxviii.21,22, 'men of Sodom,' xiii.13, xix.4, 'men of the house,' xxxix.11,14:

E has 'men of the house,' xvii.23,27.

*(xxxi) *v.*25,26, חֶרֶב, 'sword,' (4.xxvi).

*(xxxii) 25,26, הָרַג, 'kill,' (5.xii).

(xxxiii) *v.*28, 'flocks, and herds, and he-asses,' (59.xxii).

(xxxiv) *v.*28,29, 'what was in the field, . . . and all which was in the house'; *comp.* 'all which he had in the house and in the field,' xxxix.5.

(xxxv) *v.*29, 'their little-ones and their wives,' xxxiv.29, xlv.19, xlvi.5.

*(xxxvi) *v.*29. טַף, 'little-ones,' xxxiv.29, xliii.8, xlv.19, xlvi.5, xlvii.12,24, l.8,21.

*(xxxvii) *v.*30, 'dwellers in the land,' (63.xi).

*(xxxviii) *v.*30, 'among the dwellers in the land, among the Canaanite and among the Perizzite,' (63.x).

*(xxxix) *v.*30, 'I and my house,' (22.i).

(xl) *v.*31, 'harlot,' as in xxxviii.15, *comp.* xxxviii.24,24.

242. It is obvious that the age of Dinah, who (according to the story) was only *six* years old when Jacob started on his return to Canaan, *comp.* xxx.21,25, xxxi.41, must have been far too young for the above transaction, unless it be supposed that Jacob lived some years in the 'house,' which he built at Succoth, xxxiii.17, or at Shechem, xxxiii.18–20. But this supposition is at variance with the statement of the Elohist that he left Padan-Aram, 'to go to his father Isaac,' xxxi.18, *comp.* xxxv.27.

243. There are certain expressions in the above Chapter which have led some, as DELITZSCH, *p.*496, and KNOBEL, *Gen. p.*266, to assign it mainly—if not entirely—to the Elohist: *e.g.*—

(i) *v.*15,22,24, 'he circumcised every male,' as in xvii.10;

(ii) *v.*23, '*their cattle* (מִקְנֵה) *and their property* (קִנְיָן) and *all their beasts* (בְּהֵמָה); *comp.* '*his cattle, and all his beasts, and all his property,*' xxxvi.6;

'all *his cattle*, and all his gain which he had gotten, the cattle of *his property*, which he had gotten,' xxxi.18.

(iii) *v.*24,24, 'all going out at the gate of his city,' as in xxiii.10,18.

*Ans.* (iii) is of no great importance, since the Jehovist speaks of Lot 'sitting at the gate of his city,' xix.1; and (i) must have been used, if a story like this was to have been written at all. The coincidences in (ii) are certainly remarkable; the Jehovist does, indeed, use מִקְנֶה very frequently, and בְּהֵמָה, ii.20, iii.14, vi.7, vii.2,2, viii.20; and he has *both together* as here, in xlvii.18: but he nowhere else in Genesis uses קִנְיָן, which E has in xxxi.18, xxxvi.6. But the fact, that E has it *twice*, cannot be sufficient to assure it to him, as being exclusively Elohistic: he uses it nowhere else in the Pentateuch; and in Jo.xiv.4 it occurs with מִקְנֶה in a passage which may be due to the Jehovist, but certainly does not belong to E. The same formula is imitated by Ezekiel in xxxviii.12,13, but occurs nowhere else in the Bible.

Accordingly, HUPFELD, though originally he assigned this chapter mainly to the *Second Elohist*, comes finally to the conclusion, *p.*158, that it must be due to the Jehovist.

244. BOEHMER believes that he can trace in this Chapter an original story (by $E_2$), which said nothing about the dishonour of Dinah, but only described the crafty and violent conduct of Simeon and Levi; to which, however, the Compiler, wishing to relieve them from some portion of the heavy blame thus laid upon them, added, as a reason for their outrageous conduct, the dishonour done to their sister, and added also that portion of the chapter in which 'the sons of Jacob,' generally, are involved in the affair, as well as Simeon and Levi. Accordingly, he gives—

*v.*1$^a$,2$^a$,3,4,6,8$^a$,13$^a$,14–18,20–22,24–26$^a$,28–30, to $E_2$, and *v*1$^b$,2$^b$,5,7,8$^b$–12,13$^b$, 19,23,26$^b$,27,31, to the Compiler.

BOEHMER's chief reason for suspecting the composite character of the story, as above indicated, is the fact that in xlix.5–7, in the 'Blessing of Jacob,' severe censure is passed on Simeon and Levi, evidently for this very transaction, and without one word to imply that there was any palliation of their offence in the fact of their sister's wrong,—which shows, as he supposes, that the account of her maltreatment could not have stood originally as now, but must have been inserted by a later writer *after* the time when xlix.5–7 was written.

*Ans.* The craft and cruelty of Simeon and Levi, as described in this chapter, in massacreing not only Shechem the real offender, but his father, and every male of the city, plundering the place, and carrying the women and children captive,—after condoning the offence, and persuading the males to be circumcised, in order to live as one people with them,—would abundantly justify the language supposed to be used by their father towards them. By the 'sons of Jacob' in *v.*27 are probably meant *only* Simeon and Levi, as in *v.*25. The connection between *v.*26, 27, which some regard as implying a break in the narrative, is quite consistent with the Hebrew idiom, as we find it, *e.g.* between vii.15,16$^a$, or between vii.21,22.

245. Upon the whole, it appears to me certain, from the evidence above produced, that HUPFELD's latter view is correct, and that the whole chapter belongs to the Jehovist. In fact, BOEHMER's remark, *p.*240, is perfectly just, if applied to the Jehovistic writer instead of (as by him) to the Compiler:—

It is strange how often this author has to do with disagreeable sexual matters. First, we have the intercourse of the fair daughters of men with the angels whom they had corrupted,—then (besides Noah's unseemly exposure which we also owe to him) the unpleasant story of Lot's daughters,—again the quarrel of Jacob's wives about the love-apples,—and here Dinah deflowered.

We may add also Reuben's incest with Bilhah, Judah's with Tamar, the story of Pharaoh's wife, of Isaac's dalliance, of Jacob's nuptials, the sins of Sodom, Lot's offer to expose to shame his own daughters. Again, Cain's murderous rage, Abraham's insincerity and cowardice, Sarah's jealousy and harshness, Isaac's weakness like his father's, the partiality of Isaac for Esau, of Rebekah for Jacob, of Jacob for Rachel and Joseph—the revengeful feelings of Esau, the lying and craft and suppleness of Jacob, the cruel treatment of Joseph by his own brothers, and their deceitful and unfeeling conduct to their father—Joseph's harsh dealings with them, not always truthful, and his hard measures with the ruined people of Egypt,—in short, almost every story of crime or cruelty, dishonesty, cowardice, jealousy, revenge, uncleanness, in the whole Book, belongs to the Jehovist. And this corresponds to the fact that he also it is, who has left us the account of the Fall, and has branded honest and health-giving labour and the pains of childbirth, as being signs of God's curse and man's debasement. In the eyes of this writer, in fact, the whole world seems to lie under a curse: the Arts and Sciences are the discoveries of the sons of Cain, and all mankind—even the best of men—seem blackened and defiled.

246. xxxv.1-7, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*1,1,3,5,7, 'Elohim' refers to the 'El of Beth-El,' xxviii.10-21, (221), who has watched over Jacob all along, and to whom Jacob is now bound to perform the vow which he had made, according to this writer, xxviii.20-22.

(ii) *v.*1, 'Bethel,' named already by *this* author, xxviii.19, and mentioned by him proleptically in xii.8, xiii.3.

(iii) *v.*1, 'dwell there,' is inconsistent with the E. statement, xxxi.18, xxxv.27, that Isaac was going direct, after his long absence, to join his aged father at Hebron.

*(iv) *v.*1,3, 'make an altar,' as in xiii.4,—nowhere else in the Pentateuch —*comp.* (45.ii).

(v) *v.*1, 'to the EL who appeared unto thee,' *v.*3, 'to the EL who answered me in the day of my distress, and was with me in the way which I went,' *v.*7, 'for there ELOHIM was revealed to him at his fleeing from before his brother,' refers to xxviii.13-15, xxxi.13 (193.i).

(vi) *v.*1, 'at thy fleeing from before Esau thy brother,' refers to Jacob's dread of Esau, xxvii.41–45, xxxii,xxxiii.

*(vii) *v.*1,7, בָּרַח, 'flee,' (86.ix).

(viii) *v.*2,6, כָּל אֲשֶׁר עִמּוֹ, 'all which was with him,' (59.xxviii).

*(ix) *v.*2, סוּר, 'turn-aside' (43.v).

(x) *v.*2, 'the strange gods which are in the midst of you,' *v.*4, 'all the strange gods which were in their hand,' refers to the teraphim taken by Rachel, xxxi.19, 30–35.

*(xi) *v.*2, חֲלִיפוֹת, 'change,' (218.xvii).

*(xii) *v.*2, שִׂמְלֹתֵיכֶם, 'garments,' (47.vii).

(xiii) *v.*2, 'and change your garments';

*comp.* 'and he changed his garments,' xli.14, 'changes of garments,' xlv.22,22.

(xiv) *v.*3, 'the day of my distress,' *comp.* xxxii.7(8), xlii.21,21.

*(xv) *v.*3, 'and was with me in the way which I went,' (99.xii).

(xvi) *v.*4, נֶזֶם, 'earring,' as in xxiv.22,30,47.

(xvii) *v.*4, עִם, 'by,' as in xxv.11$^{b}$.

(xviii) *v.*4, 'the terebinth which was by Shechem';

*comp.* 'unto the place of Shechem, unto the terebinth of Moreh,' xii.6.

(xix) *v.*5, 'the terror of Elohim was upon the cities which were round-about, and they did not pursue after the sons of Jacob,' may refer to the protecting 'El of Beth-El,' to the violence done at the city of Shechem by the 'sons of Jacob,' and to Jacob's dread expressed in xxxiv.30: or, perhaps, 'terror of Elohim' may mean only 'a mighty terror.'

(xx) *v.*6, 'and Jacob came to Luz, which is in the land of Canaan';

*comp.* 'and Jacob came in peace to the city of Shechem, which is in the land of Canaan,' xxxiii.18.

(xxi) *v.*6, 'Luz, that is Bethel,' as in xxviii.19.

*(xxii) *v.*6, 'he, and all the people that were with him,' (22.i).

(xxiii) *v.*6, 'all the people that were with him,' (233.ix).

*(xxiv) *v.*7, 'and he built there an altar,' (45.ii).

(xxv) *v.*7, 'and he built there an altar, and called the place El-Beth-El';

*comp.* 'and he set-up there an altar, and called it El-Elohe-Israel,' xxxiii.20.

(xxvi) *v.*7, הָאֱלֹהִים, Elohim (133.ii).

(xxvii) *v.*7, Elohim used with a plural verb, as in xxxi.53,—also $E_2$ (xx.13);

*comp.* 1S.ii.27,27,iii.7,21.

247. xxxv.8, *Deuteronomist.*

The introduction of 'Deborah' in this verse is so abrupt, as strongly to suggest an interpolation. According to the story, as it now stands—in which, however, xxiv.59,60, (as we have seen,) (144,145), is most probably a Deut. interpolation—Rebekah's

nurse had left Charran with Rebekah nearly a hundred and twenty years before.* But how comes she here, just at this moment? Probably, there is no real connection with the preceding context. It is not said that *Jacob* buried her—only that she was buried. The Deuteronomist wishes to derive the name of some well-known tree near Bethel, 'the oak of weeping,' and introduces the death of the nurse for this purpose, referring to the nurse as mentioned in his own previous interpolation, xxiv.59,60.

In the E.V. the word 'oak' appears in *v.*4 as well as in *v.*8; but in Hebrew the word is different. In *v.*4 we have אֵלָה (=אֵלוֹן, xii.6), meaning a 'terebinth' or 'turpentine-tree'; in *v.*8 it is אַלּוֹן, an 'oak.'

248. Both HUPFELD and BOEHMER regard *v.*8 as not belonging to the preceding context,—the former giving *v.*1–7 to $E_2$, and *v.*8 to J,—the latter giving *v.*6,7, to C ($E_2$), *v.*5 to B (J), and *v.*1–3, 8, to D (the later Compiler). But their conclusions are greatly affected by the view which they have taken of some preceding passages, especially of the important section xxviii.10–22, which they both ascribe primarily to $E_2$, but which we give wholly to J, for reasons which are fully stated above. The only point, in fact, in respect of the passage now before us, on which we are all agreed, is this, that *v.*8 is a later interpolation, which HUPFELD assigns to the Jehovist, but BOEHMER (with us) to the later Compiler or Editor.

249. It will be seen that both HUPFELD and BOEHMER give to $E_2'$ *v.*7, in which is described the dedication of an *altar*, and HUPFELD observes, *p.*185, with reference to the *very similar* passage, xxxiii.20—(see 246.xxv):—

Certainly, the altar in that verse, with its naming, is more in the style of the

* Jacob was 130 when he went to Egypt, xlvii.9, and then Joseph was 39, xli.46, xlv.6. Hence Jacob was 91 when Joseph was born, and therefore 97 when he left Charran, xxxi.41, and at least 98 now; and he was born 20 years after Rebekah's marriage, xxv.20,26, so that 118 years must have elapsed since Rebekah and her nurse left Charran.

*Jehovist*, whose usual memorial is an altar; whereas with the Elohist ($E_2$) it occurs only in xxxv.7 at *Bethel*. There, however, as the climax of the memorial-stone, in fulfilment of the vow of making a 'House of God,' xxviii.22, and after express divine command, xxxv.1, it assumes a high, extraordinary, position, with which an altar erected already at *Shechem* of his own accord, xxxiii.20, is not quite reconcilable, though, probably, the terebinth in xxxv.4 may be.

*Ans.* The fact here noticed that xxxv.7 is the *only* passage in Genesis where $E_2$, according to HUPFELD, notices the erection of an altar, tends strongly to confirm our own view, that xxxv.7, and, if so, then the whole section *v.*1–7, and xxviii.10–22, to which it refers, belongs to the *Jehovist*.

250. HUPFELD observes, *p.*184, as to the terebinth—

This was a well-known sacred tree, which often comes forward as such in the story,—*e.g.* Jo.xxiv.26, where Joshua erects a memorial-stone under this tree, when he had renewed with the people the holy covenant upon the Law, and Ju.ix.6, where Abimelech was chosen king there, 'by the terebinth of the pillar that was in Shechem,' or, as it is called in *v.*37, 'the terebinth of the soothsayers.' It is manifestly the same tree also, which has occurred with the Jehovist already in xii.6, under the name 'terebinth of Moreh,' where Abram, at his entrance into Canaan, has the first divine appearance and promise of the holy land. Hence it was in any case a 'Sanctuary,' as Shechem is called in Jo.xxiv.26, and probably the chief ground of the holiness of Shechem.

## 251. xxxv.9–15, *Elohist.*

(i) *v.*9, 'and Elohim appeared unto Jacob';

*comp.* 'and [Elohim] appeared unto Abraham,' xvii.1.

(ii) *v.*9, 'at his coming from Padan-Aram,' refers to xxxi.18; but the phrase has, perhaps, been already imitated by J in xxxiii.18.

(iii) *v.*9, 'and He blessed him,' (1.v).

(iv) *v.*10, change of Jacob's name to Israel by Elohim, when He appeared to him, as Abram was changed to Abraham, and Sarai to Sarah, at the former appearance, xvii.5,15.

N.B. The formula here employed, 'and he called his name Israel,' and *v.*15, 'and he called the name of the place . . . Bethel,' corresponds to those used (as we suppose) by the same writer (E) in xxv.26, xxx.8$^e$,11,13,18$^e$,20$^e$,21,24$^a$.

*(v) *v.*11, 'and Elohim said unto him, I am El Shaddai';

*comp.* 'and He said unto him, I am El Shaddai,' xvii.1.

(vi) *v.*11, אֲנִי, 'I,' (19.ix).

*(vii) *v.*11, פְּרֵה וּרְבֵה, 'fructify and multiply,' (1.iv).

*(viii) *v.*11, 'a nation and a company of nations shall be out of thee, and kings shall go-forth out of thy loins,' (95.xii).

*(ix) *v.*11, 'kings shall go-forth out of thy loins,' (95.xiv).

*(x) *v.*12, 'and the land, which I gave to Abraham and to Isaac, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed after thee will I give the land,' (95.xxi and N.B.).

*(xi) *v.*12, 'to thee and to thy seed after thee,' (46.xviii).

(xii) *v.*13, 'and Elohim went up from him,' as in xvii.22.

(xiii) *v.*14, 'and Jacob set-up a pillar in the place where He had spoken with him, a pillar of stone, and poured upon it a drink-offering, and poured oil upon it,' copied, perhaps, by J in xxviii.18, 'and he took the stone which he had placed as his pillow, and placed it as a pillar, and poured oil upon the top of it.'

(xiv) *v.*10,15, the names 'Israel' and 'Bethel' indirectly derived, by a covert allusion to their meaning, as in the case of 'Sárah,' xvii.15,16, 'Isaac,' xvii.17, 'Ishmael,' xvii.20, &c.

252. The word עוֹד, 'again,' in *v.*9 has perplexed critical commentators, since there is no record by E of any former 'appearance' to *Jacob*. HUPFELD, *p.*203, and BOEHMER, *p.*245, both regard it as due to the Compiler, the former supposing it to have been inserted with reference to the occurrence interpolated just before in *v.*1, 'And Elohim said unto Jacob, Arise, go up to Bethel &c.,' and the latter, inasmuch as no 'appearance' is recorded here, supposing that the expression 'again' must refer to the account in xxviii.10–16. Yet this last also was no 'appearance,' strictly speaking; it was only a *vision* seen in a dream. May not this word belong to E, and be meant to refer to the fact, that this was the *second* appearance of Elohim to *one of the patriarchs*, (for E records no such favour granted to Isaac,) in order to give them a double assurance of the land, &c.? In fact, Elohim really appeared unto *Jacob* (as well as to Isaac) *once*, when he appeared unto Abraham; just as the land (according to E) was given to Isaac, when it was given to Abraham (95.xxi. N.B.). Elohim now appears a second time, and makes a second grant of the land to the seed of Abraham.

253. xxxv.16–20.

HUPFELD assigned this passage originally to $E_2$, and writes about this and the kindred section, xlviii.7, as follows:

It is difficult to understand what the abrupt reminiscence in xlviii.7[1]—about the death and burial of Rachel—with its geographical definition and explanation as to Ephrath—has to do in this connection, since nothing further follows from it. It seems to be composed out of xxxv.16,19, and transferred mechanically from that passage, and so suits little in the mouth of Jacob. To E in any case it cannot belong

—any more than xxxv.16, &c. from which it is derived. And, since no suitable place can be found anywhere else for it,—not xlix.29, &c. for which its contents would at first sight seem suitable,—it must, probably, be only a gloss, which has been attached to the preceding words, xlviii.3–6, (a citation from xxxv.9, &c.) but has been derived from the following section, xxxv.16, &c. which, perhaps, seemed to the Compiler to have been written with some special object. *p.*36.

The passage, xxxv.16–20, about the birth of Benjamin, and the death and burial of Rachel, following next after the extract from E, *v.*9–15, must belong to $E_2$, as might be expected from its contents, since it contains the conclusion of the special history of the birth of Jacob's children, of which we read nothing in E;[2] although in this extraordinary case the mention of Benjamin's birth would not be strange. And it is still further confirmed by the etymology,[3] the geographical notice,[4] (corresponding to *v.*8 about Deborah's grave,) which are all in the style of the later sources, not of E. *p.*46.

## 254. But HUPFELD subsequently modifies his view of this passage, and assigns it to the Jehovist, *p.*190,191.

To this source (the J. document) belongs also the passage xxxv.16, &c. This had been assigned to $E_2$, on account of its being quoted in xlviii.7, in connection with the verses preceding, *v.*3–6, which are taken from E. But I have already shown that this verse is quite foreign to the connection in which it stands,[5] and must be a gloss out of the passage before us. What, however, contradicts positively the above assumption, is especially the birth of Benjamin in *Canaan*, which is at variance with the datum in xxxv.26, due to $E_2$, according to which all the twelve sons were born in Mesopotamia.[6] On the other hand, it corresponds exactly to the J. view, which not only in xxx concludes with Joseph the list of sons born in Mesopotamia, *v.*24,25, but also on the return-journey expressly reckons only *eleven* sons, xxxii.22, and more than once assigns Joseph to Rachel as the only son, xxxiii.2,7.[7] Add to this its being connected with a geographical-antiquarian reference, which is quite in the style of the Jehovist,—especially the formula 'unto this day,' *v.*20, as in xxvi.33, xxxii.32, in the same document,[8] and וַיִּסְּעוּ, 'and they broke-up,' *v.*16, corresponding to the same phrase in *v.*5.[9] The same is true of the following station, *v.*21, 'beyond the tower of the flock' (E.V. 'Edar'), *i.e.* Ophel or Jerusalem,—another geographical-antiquarian note of the Jehovist, introduced with וַיִּסַּע in Jacob's march as in *v.*15,16.

## 255. We reply to HUPFELD's chief arguments as follows:—

(1) We may omit for the present the consideration of xlviii.7, the authorship of which will, of course, depend very much on that of xxxv.16–20.

(2) According to our view, E contained originally full accounts—not only of the births and namings of Abraham's two sons, Ishmael, xvi.15,16, and Isaac, xxi.2–5, as all allow, but also—of the births of Isaac's two sons, Esau and Jacob, xxv.24–26, and of Jacob's eleven sons and Dinah, xxix, xxx. It is, therefore, reasonable to expect that he would also give the account of the birth and naming of the remaining son, Benjamin.

But, for reasons given below, we do *not* assign to him the account of these events which we find in xxxv.17,18. The Elohistic account of Benjamin's birth probably followed that of Joseph in xxx.24ª,—without leaving, as now, an interval of *six years* between the births of Joseph and Benjamin, after the rapid births of the other children,—and has been replaced by this more graphic and tragical story of the Jehovist.

(3) E certainly does insert *some* etymologies, as of 'Abraham,' xvii.5, 'Sarah,' xvii.15, 'Isaac,' xvii.17, 'Ishmael,' xvii.20, 'Israel,' xxxv.10, 'Bethel,' xxxv.15, and, as we believe, of many others; and therefore it is *à priori* probable that he has given also that of Benjamin, though (as we suppose) in a passage now lost.

(4) E has given a very full and complete 'geographical-antiquarian notice' about the cave of Machpelah, where Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebekah, Jacob and *Leah*, were buried; and he lays special stress upon it in Jacob's last moments, xlviii.29–32, *comp.* 'and there *I* buried Leah, *v.*31. It is therefore *probable* that Jacob may also, according to this author, have made special mention in his last hours, xlviii.7, to her own son Joseph, of the grave where he had buried *Rachel*. And, if xlviii.7 belongs to E, then, of course, the passage before us must also be assigned to him.

(5) As just observed, it seems most natural that Jacob should have been made to speak upon his deathbed about the position of Rachel's grave to her own son Joseph, so that we cannot regard xlviii.7 as 'foreign to the connection in which it stands.' And it will be shown that, in fact, it belongs most probably to E.

(6) We assign xxxv.26, (as will be seen), also to E: and the statement there made, that Jacob's twelve sons were born in *Padan-Aram*, agrees fully with our view that E's account of the birth of Benjamin followed that of Joseph in xxx.24ª, but is now lost.

(7) The very preciseness and multiplicity of the Jehovistic notices—that, 'after Rachel had born *Joseph*,' he proposed to return to Canaan, xxx.25,—that 'Jacob took his two wives and his two maids and his *eleven* sons,' xxxii.22,—that 'Rachel and *Joseph*' were behind, xxxiii.2,—that '*Joseph* and Rachel' came near, xxxiii.7,—and, we may add, that 'Jehovah should add to Rachel *another son*,' xxx.24ᵇ,—indicate that he had a special object in view, *viz.* to support his own account of the birth of Benjamin; and there is probably also a connection between xxx.24ᵇ and xxxv.17, 'Fear not! thou shalt have this son also.' Perhaps, his eagerness on this point may explain the singular fact of his having omitted all mention of *Dinah* in xxxii.22.

(8) We ascribe *v.*20ᵇ, 'that is the pillar of Rachel's grave unto this day,' to J, together with the other similar formulæ, in which the phrase 'unto this day' occurs, and *v.*19ᵇ, 'that is Bethlehem,' to the later Editor; and certainly the repetition of this last in xlviii.7, 'that is Bethlehem,' *must* be a later addition to the original story.

(9) וַיִּסָּעוּ, *v.*16, does not, indeed, occur in any other passage of E in *Genesis*, —but merely it would seem, because this writer has not required to use it, since he does use it in E.xvi.1, xvii.1, xix.2ª, all which passages are ascribed by Hupfeld himself, *p.*86, and indeed by critics generally, to this writer. It is in

fact the word which he would naturally use, if he wanted to express the breaking-up of an encampment. But, according to E, Jacob clearly did make some kind of halt at Bethel, where he 'set-up a pillar,' and worshipped, *v.*14; and therefore, in *v.*16, E may very well have written, 'and they broke-up from Bethel.'

256. BOEHMER also, *p.*245–247, assigns this passage to the Jehovist, except the clauses, *v.*19$^{b}$,20$^{b}$, which he gives to the later Compiler or Editor. He draws attention, however, to the fact that in xxxv.16, xlviii.7, Rachel's grave is spoken of as lying near Bethlehem, *south* of Jerusalem, whereas in 1S.x.2 it is described as lying *north* of Jerusalem, near Ramah. Also, as the story now stands, Jacob proceeds *southward* from Bethel to Bethlehem, and then *northward* again to the 'tower of Edar' = 'tower of the flock,' *v.*21, probably *Zion*, *comp.* Mic.iv.8—

'And thou, O tower of the flock, stronghold of the daughter of Zion, &c.'

The latter difficulty is explained on our view by supposing that the Jehovist, to whom we ascribe *v.*21,22$^{a}$, has, perhaps, inserted this notice awkwardly, out of its proper place in the narrative. But the former discrepancy remains unexplained upon any theory of the composition of this passage.

THENIUS supposes that Ephrath was really a place near Bethel, and that the note, 'this is Bethlehem,' was inserted either through a mistake of a later writer, or from some design of claiming Rachel's grave for the territory of Bethlehem. BOEHMER adopts this view and adds,—

This southern position of Rachel's grave has been maintained by the later tradition, and to this day it is shown north of Bethlehem, built over with a Muhamedan mosque.

257. Our own view of this passage agrees substantially with that of HUPFELD and BOEHMER; that is to say, we assign it *mainly* to the Jehovist.

It appears to us, however, that the narrative in xxxv.16–20 was originally Elohistic. The fact that in xlviii.7 we have a *change* of statement—not 'she was buried,' as in xxxv.19, but 'I buried her,' just as in xlix.31, 'there I buried Leah,'—seems

also to indicate that xlviii.7 is not due to the Compiler, but to the Elohist, to whom also the expression in xlix.31 belongs.

It will be observed also that xlviii.7 makes no reference whatever to the *cause* and *circumstances* of Rachel's death, which, as recorded in xxxv.16–20, are so remarkable. This seems to show that the two passages, as they now stand, cannot be both due to the *same* author. If the *details* of Rachel's death in xxxv.16–20 are due (as we believe, with HUPFELD and BOEHMER) to J, then J cannot have written xlviii.7, in which no reference whatever is made to them. If, on the other hand, xlviii.7 belongs (as we believe) to E, then E cannot have written the *details* in xxxv.16-20, that is, he cannot have written the *whole* of this passage.

258. xxxv.16ª,19,20ª, *Elohist.*

(i) *v.*16ª, וַיִּסָּעוּ, 'and they broke-up,' as in E.xvi.1, xvii.1, xix.2ª, and referring to the fact that Jacob had been stopping, if even only for a day, at Bethel, receiving the revelation, erecting the pillar, and worshipping, *v.*14.

(ii) *v.*16ª, 'Bethel,' referring to the name just given in *v.*15.

(iii) *v.*19, 'was buried,' as in xxv.10.

(iv) *v.*20ª, 'and Jacob set-up a pillar,' as in *v.*14.

N.B. The explanatory note in *v.*19, 'that is Bethlehem,' belongs probably to D. It reads like a note by a later writer, as the repetition of it in xlviii.7 must certainly be, since the original historian would never have put such a notice in Jacob's mouth. It belongs probably to D (rather than to J), since he lived in an age when the older name 'Ephrath' would be more likely to need such an explanation.

259. xxxv.16ᵇ–18,20ᵇ, *Jehovist.*

The Jehovist, as we suppose, having before him the brief Elohistic notice of Rachel's death and burial, inserts this pathetic story to account for it, thereby introducing a contradiction to the E. statement in *v.*26, that *all* Jacob's sons were 'born in *Padan-Aram*,' and interposing an interval of six years between the births of Rachel's first and second sons, whereas in the E. story *all* the births seem to have followed each other in regular rapid succession.

(i) *v.*16ᵇ,17, קָשָׁה, 'be hard,' as in xlix.7, *comp.* קָשׁוֹת, 'hardly,' xlii.7ᵇ,30.

(ii) *v.*17, 'and it came to pass at her bearing,' as in xxxviii.28.

(iii) *v.*17, 'the midwife,' as in xxxviii.28.

(iv) *v.*17, 'fear not,' (171.xiv).

(v) *v.*17, 'for this son also shall be thine'; *comp.* the *second* derivation of the name 'Joseph,' xxx.24ᵇ, 'Jehovah shall add to me another son.'

*(vi) *v.*17, גַּם זֶה, 'this also,' (196.xxx).

(vii) *v.*18, 'her soul,' (59.xxi).

(viii) *v.*18, 'for she died,' clearly betrays interpolation by the way in which it anticipates the E. statement, 'and Rachel died,' in *v.*19ᵃ.

(ix) *v.*18, 'and she called his name Ben-oni (בֶּן־אוֹנִי = 'son of my labour'), and his father called him Benjamin (בִּנְיָמִין = 'son of the right-hand),' derivation of names (3.iv).

(x) *v.*18, אוֹן, 'labour,' as in xlix.3.

*(xi) *v.*20ᵇ, 'unto this day,' (99.lviii).

## 260. xxxv.21,22ᵃ, *Jehovist.*

The sudden change of the patriarch's name to 'Israel,' which occurs *thrice*, *v.*21,22ᵃ,22ᵃ, (whereas in the E. context, *before*, *v.*14,15,20, and *after*, *v.*22ᵇ,26,27,29,) we have always 'Jacob,' implies a change of author; as does also the abruptness of the whole notice, its want of connection with the context, and the looseness of the expression, 'while Israel abode in that land.' That this notice is due to the Jehovist, (as HUPFELD and BOEHMER both allow,) appears as follows.

*(i) *v.*21,22ᵃ,22ᵃ, 'Israel,' used as a personal name for Jacob, xxxv.21,22ᵃ,22ᵃ, xxxvii.3,13, xliii.6,8,11, xlv.28, xlvi.1,2,29,30, xlvii.27ᵃ,29,31, xlviii.2,8,10,11,13,13, 14,21, xlix.2, l.2.

*(ii) *v.*21, נָטָה, 'extend,' (59.x).

*(iii) *v.*21, 'pitch-tent,' (59.ix),

(iv) *v.*21, הָלְאָה, 'away,' as in xix.9.

(v) *v.*22ᵃ, שָׁכַן, 'abide,' (4.xxvii).

*(vi) *v.*22ᵃ, שָׁכַב אֶת, 'lie with,' (99.lv).

(vii) *v.*22ᵃ, 'concubine,' as in xxii.24, xxv.6,—also E(xxxvi.12).

N.B. According to E(xxxi.18, xxxv.27), Jacob was hastening to his father at Hebron, and would not have been represented as 'abiding' at this place 'beyond the tower of the flock,' *i.e.* apparently, Zion, Mic.iv.8.

## 261. xxxv. 22ᵇ–26, *Elohist.*

This list of Jacob's sons 'which were born to him in Padan-

Aram,' is the exact counterpart of the list of Esau's sons, 'which were born to him in the land of Canaan,' xxxvi.5; and it seems very natural that E should have here summed them up, after his scattered notices of their separate births, xxix, xxx, before he brings Jacob to his father at Hebron, *v.*27. According to E, as we have observed, *all* the twelve sons were most probably born in Padan-Aram as here stated: but the E. account of the birth of Benjamin, after that of Joseph in xxx, has been replaced by the more graphic Jehovistic account in xxxv.16$^{b}$–18, which introduces a discrepancy with the E. statement in *v.*26.

(i) *v.*22$^{b}$,26, 'Jacob,' as in the E. context, *before*, *v.*14,15,20, and *after*, *v.*27,29, —not 'Israel,' as in *v.*21,22$^{a}$,22$^{b}$.

(ii) *v* 26, 'these are the sons of Jacob which were born (יֻלַּד) to him in Padan-Aram';

*comp.* 'these are the sons of Esau, which were born (יֻלְּדוּ) to him in the land of Canaan,' xxxvi.5.

(iii) This list agrees in form with that of the 'sons of Esau' in xxxvi.1–5, each mother being specified with her offspring separately.

(iv) This list of the 'sons of Jacob,' followed by that of the 'sons of Esau,' corresponds also to that of the 'sons of Ishmael,' xxv.12–16, followed by that of the 'sons of Isaac,' xxv.19,20, &c. Only here the order is reversed, and the list of Jacob's sons is put *first*, because it fitly sums up the account of their births, &c., and completes the narrative of Jacob's doings from the time when he left his father, xxviii.5, till now when he returns to him, xxxv.27. This also is our reply to Hupfeld's remark, *p.*47, that this list would come better in E after xxxvii.2$^{a}$, 'these are the generations of Jacob.'

262. Boehmer writes on the above passage as follows, *p.*114:

Hupfeld assigns away from E this notice about the twelve sons of Jacob, ascribing to him very properly that given in E.i.1–5; but he does not decide as to the source from which the list before us has most probably been taken. Since, however, according to this notice, *all* the sons, including Benjamin, who is named here among the rest, were born in *Padan-Aram*, it cannot belong to the *Jehovist*, who relates especially the birth of Benjamin in *Canaan*, xxxv.16–19. And, since the *Compiler*—especially as being a zealous devotee of Jerusalem—could have had no inducement to set himself in direct contradiction to this Jehovistic statement which he had only just inserted, and which he certainly would not have forgotten, there remains only the assumption that he found this account in C($E_2$).

*Ans.* There is no reason why E should not have given the list of Jacob's sons *here*, on his return to Canaan, and *also* at the beginning of another great crisis of their history in E.i.1–5; and, in fact, he gives twice the sons of Noah, v.32, vi.10,

and the sons of Terah, xi.26,27. BOEHMER'S other reasons tend to confirm our own conclusion.

263. xxxv.27–29, *Elohist.*

All critics are agreed as to this passage being due to E. Jacob here completes the journey which he began in xxxi.18, and reaches his father at his abode in *Hebron*—where E makes all the patriarchs live (143), instead of (with $E_2$ and J) at *Beersheba.*

(i) *v.*27,29, 'Jacob,' as in the E. context; *v.*14,15,20,22$^b$,26, though *after* this writer has described the giving of the name 'Israel,' in *v.*10.

(ii) *v.*27, 'and Jacob came unto Isaac his father';

*comp.* 'to go to Isaac his father in the land of Canaan,' xxxi.18.

(iii) *v.*27, 'the city of Arba,' as in xxiii.2.

(iv) *v.*28, date of Isaac's death, (10.vii).

*(v) *v.*28, 'the days of Isaac,' (139.iii).

*(vi) *v.*28, מְאַת, 'hundred,' (10.ix).

*(vii) *v.*29, 'and Isaac expired and died, and was gathered unto his people,' (147.iv).

*(viii) *v.*29, גָּוַע, 'expire,' (19.xi).

(ix) *v.*29, 'old and full of days,' *comp.* 'old and full,' xxv.8.

*(x) *v.*29, 'and his sons Esau and Jacob buried him,' (147.vii).

In xlix.31, E makes Jacob say that 'Isaac and Rebekah' were buried in the cave of Machpelah. Rebekah's burial is not otherwise mentioned at all; and the *place* of Isaac's burial is not here named. As, however, E makes Isaac 'sojourn' at Mamre, *i.e.* Hebron, *v.*27, it follows naturally that both he and his wife were buried in the cave close by. According to the Jehovist, Isaac lived far away from Hebron at Beersheba, xxiv. 62, xxv.11$^b$, xxvi.23–33, xxviii.10.

264. xxxvi.1–43.

Both HUPFELD and BOEHMER give *v.*6–8 to E, and the former gives to him also *v.*1–5, *i.e.* altogether *v.*1–8; but on the rest of the chapter he writes as follows, *p.*61–63.

That xxxvi, with its various genealogical notices,—which are only held together from a geographical point of view, taking account of relations to the land of Edom and its inhabitants,(1) and which interrupt the course of the history,(2)—cannot

belong to E in this form, is so clear at the first glance, that already it has not escaped the observation of former unprejudiced critics, who have regarded it, at all events, as a passage of a peculiar kind, though inserted by the Elohist. The fact, that the latest criticism assigns it to E, is based partly on the supposed analogy with the genealogies in xxv.1–6,12–18, which analogy has been already rejected, and so the argument from these genealogies rather proves the contrary,[3] —partly on the Elohistic formulæ which occur in *v.*6–8, which verses certainly belong to E; but this proves nothing for the *rest* of the chapter. Further, on this ground in any case only the two genealogies of the 'sons of Esau' in *v.*1–19, together with the variation of the second list in *v.*40–43, can be included,—not the two lists of the primitive inhabitants (Horim) of Edom, and the oldest Edomite kings, which have not the most remote connection with the theocratic history of the patriarchs, as E narrates it.[4]

That, however, the list of the sons of Esau also, at least in their present form, must come from the later sources, and not from E, appears directly,—partly from the fact that the names of the wives in *v.*1–5, which are derived from the data of the genealogies that follow, *v.*9, &c., *v.*20, &c. (though the corrupt readings בָּשְׂת and חִוִּי should be corrected into בָּן and חֹרִי) differ from those of E, xxvi.34,35, xxviii.9,[5]—partly from the Jehovistic formulæ, *v.*10,40,[6] and, perhaps, the number (thirteen) of the chiefs of the sons of Esau; *comp.* the thirteen sons of Joktan, x.26,[7] &c.

Still, *v.*1–5 shows distinct signs of E.

(i) It takes up again, in *v.*2,3, the former dates about Esau's wives, xxvi.34,35, xxviii.9, where לָקַח, as pluperfect, seems to refer back to the earlier notice; and, in spite of the varying and partly corrupted names, we see glimpses of those accounts being the basis of that here given.

(ii) The form of this genealogy is quite in the style of E, and varies from that of the Jehovist.

(iii) The conclusion, *v.*5, 'which were born to him in the *land of Canaan*,' prepares for and introduces the following narrative (belonging to E) of Esau's removing to the *land of Edom*, *v.*6–8; as also this last, by the mention of 'his wives and his sons,'—though it does not of necessity imply the preceding mention of them, (for they might have been left unnamed, as in other cases, and as the *daughters* are, who are also mentioned in *v.*5,)—yet, since that mention of them does precede, is probably based upon it.[8]

Since, now, that closing formula in *v.*8 forms the contrast to the sons who were born *in Edom*, and this actually appears in the conclusion of the superscription of the second genealogy, *v.*9, 'in mount Seir,' as well as in the constant refrain, 'in the land of Edom,' *v.*16, &c., it might seem that this second genealogy also, *v.*9–14, as the necessary complement of the first, must belong to E. But this is negatived by its contents, which do not supply the *complement*, but only a *repetition*, of the first, though with the addition of the grandsons in the case of each son, and are to this extent only a continuation of that,[9]—(but of this second genealogy are then formed thirteen heads of the Edomites, who are

reckoned up in *v.*15, &c.[10]) This is an amplification, which cannot have lain in the plan of E.[11].

Consequently, only the first section, *v.*1-8—yet, of course, without the ethnographical notes, 'who is Edom,' *v.*1, 'Esau is Edom,' *v.*8,[12] and without the contradictions in the names of the wives, which have been derived from other sources or corrupted,—can have been taken from E. All the rest must have been drawn from later sources by the Jehovist or the Compiler.

## 265. Let us now consider the force of the above arguments.

(1) This applies only to the account of the Horim in *v.*20–30; since all the rest of the chapter is concerned with the direct descendants of Esau; and, as we have seen that E expatiates somewhat in xxv.12–16 upon the fortunes of *Ishmael* (156), as well as Isaac, so he may here have given some account of those of *Esau*, as well as Jacob. The account about Ishmael is short in proportion to the short E. account about the life of Isaac, xxv.19,20,21ᵇ,24–26; and the more copious information here given about Esau's descendants may be in like manner proportioned to the more full account which he intends to give of Jacob and his descendants; or it may be more complete, simply because he knew more about the *Edomites* of his time than about the *Arabians*.

(2) The list of Esau's descendants, except for its greater length, does not interrupt the course of the history more than that about Ishmael's in xxv.12–16, or Jacob's in xlvi.8–27.

(3) This argument must now, of course, be reversed for us, as regards xxv.12–16, since we assign this passage itself to E(152).

(4) Surely, the account of the Edomite *kings*, descended from Abraham, would be quite in its place, as a proof of the actual fulfilment of the promises recorded by E in xvii.6,16, as having been made by El Shaddai to Abraham, '*kings* shall come out of thee,' '*kings* of peoples shall be of thee.'

Rather, we must *expect* to find some record of this kind made by E, to show how these promises had been fulfilled, as we have had already in xxv.16,—'*twelve princes* according to their folks,'—a record of the fulfilment of the other promise made to Abraham on the same occasion about Ishmael, xvii.20, *viz.* '*twelve princes* shall he beget.' In fact, 'kings of *peoples*' out of the loins of Abraham only existed, when *both* Edom and Israel had kings.

(5) It seems just as reasonable to suppose that the Edomite accounts or traditions about the names may have been uncertain, so that E himself may have written them differently at different times,—*viz.*, in *v.*2,3, of this chapter and in xxvi.34,35, xxviii.9,—without correcting the earlier notices, as it is to suppose that the Jehovist (or Compiler) changed the original names in *v.*1–5, in order to make them agree with the following data, *without also changing them in the other passages*. Uz, for instance, is described here as a *Horite*, *v.*28; whereas J makes him the firstborn of *Aram*, x.23, and he also makes him the firstborn of *Nahor*, xxii.21, so that here also we have, apparently, a similar instance of uncertain tradition or, perhaps, conjecture.

(6) The formula 'These are the names of &c.,' *v.*10,40, is *not* a J. formula. It occurs nowhere, as we believe, in any J. passage, (since we assign xxv.12,16, xlvi.8, to E), and it *does* occur in E.i.1, which HUPFELD and BOEHMER both give without the least hesitation to E.

The other formulæ in *v.*40,43, are (α) 'after their families,' (β) 'after their places,' (γ) 'by their names,' (δ) 'after their habitations': and of these (α) occurs in x.5,20,31, and is, therefore, *so far* Jehovistic; but it occurs also in viii.19, (E)—(β) and (δ) are found nowhere else in the Bible, and since they do *not* occur among the numerous formulæ employed by the Jehovist in x.5,20,31,32, (where we have 'after their families,' 'by their nations,' 'after their tongues,' 'by their lands,' 'after their generations,') they are more probably *not* Jehovistic,—(γ) occurs only *once* besides, in xxv.13, which we have assigned to E.

(7) It might be said that, if there is any imitation here, it is J in x who has copied from E in this passage. But Prof. HUPFELD says only 'perhaps,' and lays no stress on this argument.

(8) We assent, of course, fully to this reasoning.

(9) Surely, the addition of the *grandsons* in *v.*9–14 *is* a complementary addition or carrying-on of the first genealogy; and, according to our view, it bears just the same relation to the list of the 'sons of Esau' as xlvi.8–27 does to the list of the 'sons of Jacob.' Jacob's *sons*, xxxv.22$^{b}$,26, were born in *Padan-Aram*; his *grandsons*, xlvi.8–27, were born in *Canaan*: conversely, Esau's *sons*, xxxvi.1-5, were born in *Canaan*; his *grandsons*, *v.*9–14, were born in *Edom*. And in *both* lists of grandsons the *sons* of each *mother* are given at full length with precisely similar formulæ.

(10) No doubt the list of 'dukes,' *i.e.* probably, *clans* or tribal divisions, in *v.*15–19, does belong to the same author as *v.*9–14, *i.e.* as we believe to E.

(11) For the reasons stated above in (1), we cannot admit this.

(12) These ethnographic notes in *v.*1,8, are probably due to E(269.N.B.i), or else to the Compiler or Editor, *i.e.* as we suppose, the Deuteronomist.

266. BOEHMER gives only *v.*6-8 to E, and writes thus, *p.*87:

*v.*9–14 must belong to the Jehovist, since he introduces the list of the 'sons of Ishmael' in xxv.12,13, with exactly the same formulæ, and prefixes them to the 'generations of Isaac,' *v.*19, &c. after the account of Abraham's death, just exactly as here he prefixes the 'sons of Esau' to 'the generations of Jacob,' xxxvii.2$^{a}$.

*Ans.* It is obvious that, in our view, the above remark, in connection with (152), serves only to fix the passage *v.*9–14, and therefore also *v.*15–19, on E.

BOEHMER, however, assigns the whole chapter as follows:—

*v.*6–8, to A(E),—*v.*1$^{a}$,2$^{b}$,3,9–14,20-24$^{a}$,25–28, to B(J),—*v.*2$^{a}$,4,5$^{b}$,15–17,19, to C($E_2$),—*v.*1$^{b}$,2$^{c}$,5$^{a}$,18,24$^{b}$,29,31–43, to D (the Compiler), who has also inserted 'the daughter of Zibeon,' *v.*14, and 'the daughter of Anah,' *v.*25, and has dropped out of B the clause 2$^{a}$, 'Esau took wives,' because it was expressed in C, 'Esau took his wives of the daughters of Canaan.'

*Ans.* The above appears at first sight exceedingly artificial, and could not be received, unless commended by strong internal evidence,—especially such evidence as *fixes* these passages, or some of them, at all events, on the different writers in question. But, after a careful examination of BOEHMER's reasoning, I am obliged to say that his ingenious scheme does not appear to me to be supported by any sufficiently strong internal evidence. And, in fact, its very basis is destroyed, when it is shown, as above, that *v.*9–14 does belong to E. Besides which, if the Jehovist gave 'the sons of Aholibamah' in *v.*14, what reason can be alleged for his *not* giving Aholibamah herself in the list of Esau's wives, *v.*2$^{b}$, a clause which BOEHMER assigns as above, to $E_2$? But, if one part of his system is disturbed, the whole comes to the ground at once. In fact, it seems to be only an ingenious attempt to maintain the completeness of the *three* independent original documents, assumed by both HUPFELD and BOEHMER.

## 267. xxxvi.1–43, *Elohist*, except *v.*20-30,35$^{b}$.

(i) *v.*1–5, this list of *Esau's* sons, following that of *Jacob's*, xxxv.22–26, and in connection with the *death and burial of Isaac*, xxxv.27–29, corresponds to that of *Isaac's* sons, xxv.24–26, following that of *Ishmael's*, xxv.13–16, and in connection with the *death and burial of Abraham*, xxv.7–10. The difference, that in the latter case both lists *follow* the death of Abraham, and Ishmael's *first*, while here Jacob's list *precedes* the death of Isaac, and Esau's *follows* it, arises merely from the writer's thinking it expedient to sum up Jacob's sons, who had been 'born in Padan-Aram,' when he returned to the land of Canaan some years before his father's death.

(ii) *v.*1,9, 'and these are the generations of Esau,' (2.iii).

(iii) *v.*2, 'Esau took his wives out of the daughters of Canaan,' refers to xxvi.34, xxviii.9.

(iv) *v.*2, 'daughters of Canaan,' as in xxviii.1,6,8:

J says 'daughters of the Canaanite,' xxiv.3,37.

(v) *v.*3, 'daughter of Ishmael, sister of Nebaioth,' as in xxviii.9.

(vi) *v.*3, 'Nebaioth,' as in xxv.13,xxviii.9,—only besides in 1Ch.i.29 (copied from xxv.13) and Is.lx.7.

(vii) *v.*5, 'these are the sons of Esau, which were born to him in the land of Canaan';

*comp.* 'these are the sons of Jacob, which were born to him in Padan-Aram,' xxxv.26.

*(viii) *v.*6, 'and Esau took his wives and his sons and his daughters, and all the souls of his house, and his cattle, and all his beasts, and all his wealth which he had gotten in the land of Canaan,' (60.v).

(ix) *v.*6, 'his cattle . . . and all his wealth';

*comp.* 'the cattle of his wealth,' xxxi.18:

J has also 'their cattle and their wealth and all their beasts,' xxxiv.23.

*(x) *v.*7, 'for their gain was much, above dwelling together; and the land of their sojournings was not able to bear them because of their cattle,'

*comp.* 'and the land did not bear them to dwell together; for their gain was much, and they were not able to dwell together,' xiii.6.

*(xi) *v.*7, 'land of their sojournings,' (95.xxii).

(xii) *v.*8, 'and Esau dwelt in mount Seir';

*comp.* 'and Jacob dwelt . . . in the land of Canaan,' xxxvii.1.

N.B. According to E, Esau was still living in the land of Canaan, when Jacob returned from Padan-Aram, and only went away to the land of Seir because of the multitude of their common stock of cattle; nor does this writer intimate any hostility whatever as having ever existed between Esau and Jacob.

According to J, Esau was already settled in the land of Seir, when Jacob returned from Padan-Aram, xxxii.3, xxxiii.14,16; and he represents Jacob as greatly in dread at first of his brother's anger, xxxii.7,8,11,20, but afterwards promising to come to him to *Seir*, xxxiii.14.

(xiii) *v.*9–14, this list of the sons and grandsons of Esau corresponds to the similar one for Jacob in xlvi.8–27, and the very same phrases are employed there as here:—

*(α) *v.*10, 'these are the names of the sons of Esau';

*comp.* 'and these are the names of the sons of Israel,' xlvi.8, and see (152.iv)

(β) *v.*12,13,14, 'the sons of Adah (Bashemath, Aholibamah) Esau's wife';

*comp.* 'the sons of Rachel, Jacob's wife,' xlvi.19, and the notices in xlvi.15,18, 22,25.

(γ) *v.*12,13, the notices *sub*scribed, *v.*14, the notice *super*scribed;

*comp.* the *sub*scriptions in xlvi.15,18,22,25, the *super*scription in xlvi.19.

(xiv) *v.*31–39, this notice about the 'kings of Edom' seems almost *essential* to the plan of E (265.[4]).

(xv) *v.*39, 'daughter of Matred, daughter of Mezahab';

*comp.* 'daughter of Anah, daughter of Zibeon,' *v.*2.

*(xvi) *v.*40, 'these are the names of the clans of Esau,' (152.iv).

(xvii) *v.*40, 'after their families,' 'after their places,' 'by their names,' *v.*43, 'after their habitations,' (265[vi]).

*(xviii) *v.*43, אֲחֻזָּה 'possession,' (95.xxiii).

N.B. In *v.*16 'duke Korah' may be inserted by a mistake of a copyist (Knobel, Keil, Delitzsch), since this name does not occur among the sons of Eliphaz in *v.*11,12. Also, the *thirteen* names in *v.*10–14, which (with the above correction) are now repeated in *v.*15–19, may be the names of the Edomite *tribes*, derived from their heads in former days; while the *eleven* names in *v.*40–43, (of which only two, Timnah and Kenaz, agree with those in the former lists,) may be the names of their *towns* or places of settlement. This last seems to be implied by the accurate definitions of the *super*scription, *v.*40, 'after their families, after their *places*,' and the *sub*scription, *v.*43, 'after their *habitations* in the land of their possession.'

268. Several of the names of 'dukes' in *v.*40–43 have been identified with names of *places*. Thus *Elah*=Elath or Eloth,

D.ii.8, 1K.ix.26, 2K.xiv.22,xvi.6, the famous Edomite port at the northern extremity of the Red Sea, near the modern Akaba. So *Pinon*=Punon, one of the stations of the Israelites in the wilderness, N.xxxiii.42,43, between Petra and Zoar, to which in the Diocletian persecution many Christian prisoners were sent to labour. *Teman*=the 'land of the Temanite,' *v.*34; and *Mibzar* (מִבְצָר, 'fortress,') may be Petra, which is called Selah (סֶלַע, 'rock') in 2K.xiv.7, *comp.* Ps.lx.9,—

'Who will bring me into the strong city (עִיר מָצוֹר, 'city of fortress')? Who will lead me into Edom?'

In *v.*32, for 'Bela (בֶּלַע) the son of Beor,' Targ. Jon. has 'Balaam (בִּלְעָם) the son of Beor.'

269. xxxvi.20-30,35ᵖ, *Jehovist*, *v.*43ᵇ, *Deuteronomist.*

We do not find anywhere in E any account of tribes, such as the Horim, altogether outside of the races descended from Abraham. This passage is therefore, most probably, an interpolation, and by the hand of the Jehovist, who has given us the genealogies of similar tribes in xxii.20-24, xxv.1-4, as well as the catalogue of nations in x.

*(i) *v.*20, 'dwellers in the land,' (63.xi).

*(ii) *v.*24, מָצָא, 'find,' (3.xiv).

(iii) *v.*35ᵖ, 'who smote Midian in the field of Moab' seems to be an insertion by the Jehovist, as it contains הִכָּה, 'smite,' (5.xxi), and 'field of Moab,' *comp.* 'field of Edom,' xxxii.3.

N.B. (i) The notice in *v.*43, 'that is Esau, the father of Edom,' may be due to the later Editor, as it is in the same form with the other notes which we ascribe to him. But those in *v.*1,19, 'Esau, who is Edom,' and *v.*8, 'Esau is Edom,' are in a different form, and seem to be by the hand of E, who has *hinted* at the name 'Edom' in xxv.25, but has only there *mentioned* 'Esau,' and therefore would require to connect expressly, as here, Esau with Edom, whereas J connects Esau with Edom in xxv.30.

N.B. (ii) E makes Aholibamah the daughter of Anah, and granddaughter of Zibeon the *Hivite*, *v.*1. But if the 'Aholibamah daughter of Anah' in *v.*25 is meant for the same person, as seems to be intended, she is there described as the *niece* of Zibeon the *Horite*, since her father Anah, *v.*25, is evidently the 'Anah' of *v.*20, *i.e.* the brother of Zibeon: *comp.* the names Lotan, Shobal, Zibeon, Anah, &c. *v.*20, and 'sons of Lotan,' *v.*22, 'sons of Shobal,' *v.*23, 'sons of Zibeon,' *v.*24, 'sons

of Anah,' *v.*25, &c. Hence the Anah, *son* of Zibeon, of *v.*24, who discovered the 'hot-springs' of Callirhoe, as there described (הַיְמִים, E.V. 'mules') was a *nephew* of the Anah in *v.*25, the father of Aholibamah, and *brother* of Zibeon. There is a discrepancy here, which it is not easy to explain; though it might, perhaps, be said that Zibeon had adopted his niece (Aholibamah) after her father (Anah)'s death.

270. The difficulty arising from the fact, that the names of Esau's wives in xxxvi.2,3, are different from those in xxvi.34, xxviii.9, remains on any theory as to the composition of this Chapter. On HUPFELD'S view, if the Compiler changed the names which stood originally in *v.*2,3, (supposed to have been identical with those previously given by E in xxvi.34, xxviii.9,) having corrected them from the Jehovistic data in *v.*10,14, why did he not also rectify them in those earlier notices? The same question might be asked of BOEHMER, since the Compiler, according to his view, had so much to do with the manipulation of this Chapter. HENGSTENBERG, iii.*p.*273-278, tries to explain the matter as follows:—

(i) He supposes (with HUPFELD) that 'daughter (בַּת) of Zibeon,' *v.*2, is an error of transcription for 'son (בֵּן) of Zibeon,'—(ii) 'Zibeon the *Hivite*,' (הַחִוִּי) is either (with HUPFELD) a mistake for 'Zibeon the *Horite* (הַחֹרִי),' or he was a Hivite, but is also called a Horite, because his people were *troglodytes*, living in caves (from חוֹר 'a cave')—(iii) Anah, who has now become '*son* of Zibeon the *Horite*,' was that Anah, son of Zibeon, who 'found the hot-springs in the wilderness,' *v.*24, and from this was called בְּאֵרִי, 'Beeri'='man of the well,' and thus we have 'Aholibamah, daughter of *Beeri*, the son of Zibeon, the *Horite-Hivite*,'—(iv) or, since 'Hittite' was a general name for all Canaanite nations, Jo.i.4, 1K.x.29, 2K.vii.6, it might include these 'Horite-Hivites,' and so we should have 'Aholibamah, daughter of Beeri the *Hittite*,' who (v) took the name 'Aholibamah' at her marriage, but was previously '*Judith*, daughter of Beeri the Hittite,' as she is styled in xxvi.34, and (vi) lastly, '*Bashemath*, daughter of Elon the Hittite, xxvi.34, and '*Mahalath*, daughter of Ishmael,' xxviii.9, changed also their names at marriage to *Adah* and *Bashemath* respectively. And so we have the three wives of Esau, as registered in xxxvi.2,3, the same as those named in the previous notices.

*Ans.* HENGSTENBERG'S ingenious suggestion is subject to fatal objections:—

(i) בְּאֵר means a *pit* or dug well, not a 'spring,' much lest a 'hot-spring';

(ii) The *Horim* in Scripture are always a separate people, like the *Avim*, *Emim*, *Zamzummim*, *comp.* G.xxxvi.20, D.ii.12,22, and they had nothing in common with the Hivites;

(iii) The 'Anah' in *v.*24, who 'found the hot-springs,' is, as we have seen, (269.N.B.ii), a different person from the Anah, father of Aholibamah in *v.*20,25.

Upon the whole, it seems to us most probable, either that the Edomite traditions were uncertain about Esau's wives,—or that, perhaps, different accounts reached the writer at different times, —and that the data in this Chapter were recorded by him without correcting those which he had already given in xxvi.34, xxviii.9.

271. xxxvii–l.

Jacob's story seems to have been connected closely by E with the fortunes of Joseph. But it was probably told by him *very briefly*, as we find in the life of Isaac merely a few facts barely stated by this writer, and not a single incident in his history dwelt upon minutely at length. So, too, in the history of Noah we have nothing told us in detail except the account of the Deluge. And even in that of Abraham, we have only the appearance of El Shaddai, with its attendant circumstances, xvii, and the purchase of the possession of a burial-place at Hebron, xxiii; but all other facts of his life are mentioned as briefly as possible. It is, therefore, very unlikely *à priori* that, in relating the history of Jacob and Joseph, the Elohist should have departed so entirely from his usual style, as must have been the case, if much of the detailed transactions and conversations, recorded in these last chapters of Genesis, were found to be due to his hand.

272. It is plain, however, that E must have mentioned the fact of Joseph's having been taken down to Egypt in some way before his father and brethren; since he says in E.i.5, 'and Joseph was in Egypt,' and he omits his name in the list of Jacob's sons who 'came with Jacob,' E.i.2,4. And the *prominent mention of him*, apart from the rest, in E.i.6—'and Joseph died, and all his brethren,—and all that generation,'—shows that E must also have represented Joseph as having attained some position of distinction and pre-eminence among them. Accordingly, we shall find that a few fragments of E's narrative may still be detected in these last chapters of Genesis.

But the great mass of the story of Joseph is certainly not from his hand. And, from the fragments of his which now remain, it is impossible to say in *what* way, according to the original story, Joseph was supposed to have been taken down to Egypt, or his father and brothers brought to him. Nothing, however, remains to show that there was in the narrative of E any account of ill-feeling existing between Joseph and his brothers, —any more than between Esau and Jacob, or between Leah and Rachel, the whole account of whose rivalry, as we have seen, as well as that of Isaac's partiality for Esau, and Rebekah's for Jacob, and Jacob's for Rachel and her two sons, is due to the Jehovist.

273. HUPFELD does not attempt to separate the history of Joseph into its component portions, but contents himself with pointing out some indications of the composite character of the narrative, and assigns it generally to $E_2$ and J, observing as follows, *p.*71 :—

> The difference of the sources, from which this early part of the history of Joseph is composed, will not therefore be denied. In the latter part of it also there are traces of the same, which have been already pointed out by ILGEN, but which I will not here investigate further.

He writes also, *p.*192 :—

> The same relation shows itself in the last section of Genesis, (the history of Joseph and of Joseph's family in Egypt,) between the second Elohist and the parallel passages which have been assigned to the Jehovist, and would to all appearance show itself also in the yet unresolved body of this section, if the separation of its parts were completed. Into this enquiry, however, I cannot undertake to enter, in this already too-extended Treatise.

274. Thus we lose almost entirely henceforward the advantage of comparing our results with those of this eminent critic, with whom hitherto we have on very many points agreed, while differing from BOEHMER. The latter has completed the examination of Genesis; but, in consequence of the important differences with which he has started, by assigning iv to the Compiler, and xiv,xv, to the Second Elohist, the divergence in our conclusions must necessarily be expected to be considerable.

It should be observed, however, that these differences affect mainly the *secondary* question, *viz.*, to whom belong those portions of Genesis which remain, when the Elohistic passages are removed from it. As to the latter, it will be seen, there exists a very great degree of unanimity between our three independent conclusions.

275. xxxvii.1,2ª, *Elohist.*

(i) *v.*1,2ª, 'Jacob,' as in the E. context, xxv.14,15,20,22ᵇ,26,27,29, xxxvi.6.

(ii) *v.*1, 'and Jacob dwelt . . . in the land of Canaan'; *comp.* 'and Esau dwelt in mount Seir,' xxxvi.8.

*(iii) *v.*1, 'in the land of his father's sojournings,' (95.xxii).

(iv) *v.*2ª, 'these are the generations of Jacob,' (2.iii).

(v) *v.*2ª, 'the generations of Jacob,' after 'the generations of Esau,' xxxvi.1; *comp.* 'the generations of Isaac,' xxv.19, after 'the generations of Ishmael,' xxv.12.

(vi) *v.*2ª, date of the adventure, by which, according to E, Joseph was taken to Egypt, (10.vii).

(vii) *v.*2ª, אֶת, 'with,' *thrice* together, as in ix.10,10,10; it occurs also *twice* together in vi.18,18, viii.17,17, ix.9,9, xvii.27,27, xxiii.8.8, xlvi.7,7, l.13,13, all Elohistic passages,—also in J (xliii.16,16, xliv.26,26,)—from which facts it seems *most* probable that this phenomenon is due to E.

(viii) *v.*2ª, 'the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah' only, who disappear altogether from the rest of the narrative.

276. The expression in *v.*2ª, 'Joseph *was* tending among the flocks,' seems to imply that the writer is speaking of some particular occasion, on which Joseph met with the adventure in question. And so BOEHMER observes, who notes further, *p.*88, that the phrase 'tending among the flocks,' not 'tending the flocks,' shows that it is meant to be said that Joseph was at that time present with the flocks, 'when'—something happened. It is possible that E may have gone on to describe Joseph's being kidnapped one day, when he was *accidentally* with these four brothers, and so taken down to Egypt. In fact, if it had been intended to say that Joseph was *habitually* thus employed in tending sheep with the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah, so that *v.*2ª would be in connection with the following story, and would not belong to E,—we should expect to find some special

mention made again of these particular brethren,—at least, we should expect to find it stated that the 'sons of Bilhah and Zilpah' hated Joseph for his evil reports about them; whereas they are never mentioned again, and we read only of 'his brethren,' generally, throughout the rest of this part of the story.

ILGEN gives also *v.*1,2ª, to E; BOEHMER gives *v.*1 to E, *v.*2ª, as far as 'with his brethren,' to J, and the rest to the Compiler.

277. xxxvii.2ᵇ–27, *Jehovist.*

We suppose that J, by inserting *v.*2ᵇ, began to modify the original story, introducing thus a ground of ill-will between Joseph and his brethren. As above observed, 'the sons of Bilhah and the sons of Zilpah' disappear altogether from the story. And, in fact, we have in *v.*21,22, *Reuben*, and, in *v.*26, *Judah*, expressly named as being with the party tending the sheep, *v.*12–16; and afterwards *all* the brothers, except Benjamin, are implicated in the abduction of Joseph, xlii.21,36.

*(i) *v.*3,13, 'Israel,' as a personal name for Jacob, (260.i).

*(ii) *v.*3, Israel's 'loving' Joseph corresponds to Isaac's 'loving' Esau, and Rebekah's 'loving' Jacob, xxv.28, Jacob's 'loving' Rachel, xxix.18, Shechem's 'loving' Dinah, xxxiv.3, Jacob's 'loving' Benjamin, xliv.20.

*(iii) *v.*3, 'and Israel loved Joseph more than all his sons,' *v.*4, 'their father loved him more than all his brethren';

*comp.* 'and he loved Rachel more than Leah,' xxix.30.

*(iv) *v.*3, 'son of his old-age,' (116.iv).

N.B. *Benjamin* might have been called the son of Jacob's 'old-age,' as in xliv.20, with reference to the account of *this* author, that he was born six years after Joseph, xxxv.16, &c., when the number of Jacob's family seemed to have been *for some time completed.* But how can *Joseph* have been properly so designated, who was born, as the story now stands, the last, indeed, of eleven, but of eleven all born within seven years, in the lusty prime of Jacob's manhood? In fact, for six years after Joseph's birth, Jacob worked hard for Laban, and was 'consumed by the drought by day and the frost by night.' xxxi.40.

*(v) *v.*4,5,8, שָׂנֵא, 'hate,' (141.lx).

(vi) *v.*5–10, Joseph's dreams, *comp.* xxviii.12, xxxi.10,11,24.

*(vii) *v.*5,8, 'add to hate,' (5.iv).

*(viii) *v.*7, נִצָּב, 'stand upright,' (97.v).

(ix) *v.*8, 'and because of his words,' refers to *v.*2ᵇ, 'Joseph brought to their father their evil-report.'

(x) *v.*9,10, 'and he recounted it,' as in xxiv.66, xxix.13,—$E_2$(xl.8,9, xli.8,12).

(xi) *v.*10, 'thy mother,' *i. e.* Leah,—Rachel being dead, xxxv.19.

*(xii) *v.*10, 'bow to the earth,' (97.ix).

(xiii) *v.*11, קִנֵּא, 'be jealous,' (166.xxiv).

(xiv) *v.*13, לְכָה, 'come,' as in xxxi.44.

(xv) *v.*14, 'and he sent him from the valley of Hebron,' where Jacob was living according to E(xxxv.27).

*(xvi) *v.*15,17, מָצָא, 'find,' (3.xiv).

(xvii) *v.*15, תָּעָה, 'wander,' as in $E_2$(xx.13, xxi.14).

*(xviii) *v.*15,16, בִּקֵּשׁ, 'seek,' as in xxxi.39, xliii.9,30.

(xix) *v.*17, מִזֶּה, 'from this,' xxxvii.17, xlii.15, l.25;

*comp.* also בָּזֹאת, 'in this,' (286.xxii).

(xx) *v.*18, מֵרָחֹק, 'from a distance,' as in xxii.4.

*(xxi) *v.*18, טֶרֶם, 'not yet,' (3.ii).

*(xxii) *v.*18, הָמִית, 'put-to-death,' (97.xl).

(xxiii) *v.*19. 'a man to his brother,' as in xxvi.31, xlii.21.

(xxiv) *v.*19, 'lord of dreams,' refers to *v.*5–10, *comp.* 'lords of arrows,' xlix.23—also $J_2$(xiv.13).

(xxv) *v.*19, הַלָּזֶה, 'this,' as in xxiv.65.

*(xxvi) *v.*20,26, הָרַג, 'kill,' (5.xii).

(xxvii) *v.*21,22, הִצִּיל, 'deliver,' (218.xxiv).

*(xxviii) *v.*21,22, 'deliver out of the hand of,' (5.xv).

(xxix) *v.*22, 'lay no hand upon him';

*comp.* 'lay not thine hand upon the boy,' xxii.12.

(xxx) *v.*22, לְמַעַן, 'in order that,' (59.xviii).

(xxxi) *v.*23, 'coat of parts,' refers to *v.*3.

*(xxxii) *v.*25, 'eat bread,' (186.xxxi).

*(xxxiii) *v.*25, 'lift-up the eyes and see,' (63.xv).

*(xxxiv) *v.*25, 'camels,' (59.xxiii).

(xxxv) *v.*25, 'going to carry-down,' *comp.* 'going to die,' xxv.32.

*(xxxvi) *v.*27, 'our brother, our flesh, is he,' (196.xv).

N.B. The copious reasoning in *v.*26,27, is quite in the style of the Jehovist.

278. xxxvii.28[a], *Elohist.*

This may have been part of the story of E, who uses the word סֹחֵר, 'merchant,' as here, in the *only other place where it occurs in the Pentateuch, viz.* xxiii.16—though the *verb* is also used in xxxiv.10,21. There is certainly plain evidence of interpolation here—of *some* disturbance of the order of the original narrative. For these 'Midianites' cannot be identical with the 'Ishmaelites,' already named, *v.*25,27, since the Hebrew text has

plainly 'and there passed-over *men, Midianites, merchants,*' the expression being quite *indefinite*, as in D.xiii.13(14), Ju. xix.22,&c.,—not '*the* Midianites,' as it must have been, if the Ishmaelites of *v.*25,27, were here referred to. And we shall see below that these 'Midianites' are kept quite distinct from the 'Ishmaelites' in the sequel of the story.

279. The fact of the distinct fusing of two different accounts, at this particular point of the history, is recognised by ILGEN, HUPFELD, and BOEHMER; and, of these, ILGEN assigns the words before us, as we do, to E, whereas the others give them to $E_2$. We shall consider their view of the passage below (283-285), at the close of our analysis of this Chapter.

Our own view is this, that, perhaps, *v.*28[a] followed originally *v.*2[a], and that E went on to describe very briefly (after his fashion) an ordinary case of kidnapping—these Midianites, who were 'passing by' on their way to Egypt, having caught and carried off with them Joseph some day, while tending the sheep with only *four* of his brothers, so that he was more likely to have been found alone, or beyond the reach of their help, or even beyond their power to help him—which seems to be the only reason that can be imagined for the writer's mentioning expressly 'the sons of Bilhah and the sons of Zilpah' only in *v.*2[a].

280. Perhaps, E may have given the account of this transaction in a very few words, *e.g.*—

(2a) 'These are the generations of Jacob. Joseph, a son of seventeen years, was tending with his brothers among the flocks, and he was a boy with the sons of Bilhah and with the sons of Zilpah, his father's wives. (28a) And there passed-over Midianites, merchants; [*and they took Joseph, and carried him away with them.*] (56) And the Midianites sold him into Egypt to Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh, captain of the guard.'

But this brief account of E did not satisfy the Jehovist, who introduced the whole story in this Chapter of Joseph's maltreatment by his brethren, retaining only (as far as we can see) *three* fragments of the original narrative, *viz.*, *v.*1,2[a],*v.*28[a],*v.*36.

ILGEN, HUPFELD, and BOEHMER, also admit that the 'Midianites' were originally represented as having *kidnapped* Joseph in the absence of his brethren, while the 'Ishmaelites' are described as having *bought* him. But they understand the matter differently, as will appear below.

281. xxxvii.28$^{b}$–35, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*28$^{b}$, the 'Ishmaelites,' as in *v.*25.

(ii) *v.*28$^{b}$, 'twenty of silver,' *comp.* 'three hundred of silver,' xlv.22,—also $E_2$(xx.16).

*(iii) *v.*29, בֶּגֶד, 'vestment,' (141.lviii).

(iv) *v.*31–33, the 'coat,' refers to *v.*3,23.

(v) *v.*31, שָׁחַט, 'slay,' as in xxii.10($E_2$).

*(vi) *v.*32, מָצָא, 'find,' (3.xiv).

(vii) *v.*32, 'discern, I pray,' as in xxxviii.25(180.xxiii).

*(viii) *v.*32, אִם־לֹא, 'if not,' (97.xxx).

(ix) *v.*33, 'and he rent his garments (שִׂמְלֹת),' as in xliv.13.

*(x) *v.*33,33, טָרַף, 'tear-in-pieces,' (220.xlvi).

*(xi) *v.*34, 'many days,' (128.iv).

(xii) *v.*35, 'and he refused,' xxxvii.35, xxxix.8, xlviii.19.

*(xiii) *v.*35,35, נָחַם, 'comfort,' (11.ii).

*(xiv) *v.*35, בָּכָה, 'weep,' (180.xli).

282. xxxvii.36, *Elohist.*

This appears to be the continuation of *v.*28$^{a}$; but the E. link, describing how these 'Midianites' became possessed of Joseph, has been lost, having been replaced by the J. account of the 'Ishmaelites,' *v.*28$^{b}$. Of these last it has been said already, *v.*28$^{b}$, 'they brought Joseph to Egypt'; here it is said, 'the Midianites sold him *into Egypt* to Potiphar &c.' where the form of the expression implies that this is not (as might be supposed) the same writer as before, using the term 'Midianites' as synonymous with 'Ishmaelites'; for then, after *v.*28$^{b}$, he would most probably have written here, 'and the Midianites sold him to Potiphar' or 'sold him *in* Egypt to Potiphar.' In fact, the account of the 'Ishmaelites' selling him is given afterwards by the Jehovist himself in xxxix.1. But he has here, as we suppose, somewhat clumsily retained the original words of E.

283. ILGEN assigns with us *v.*1,2ª,28ª,36, to E; but he gives to him also other portions of the Chapter, *viz.* *v.*2ᵇ,3,21,22,24, 29–31,34, and parts of *v.*14,18,23,25,28,32, which are shown by our analysis to be certainly *not* due to E,—and the rest to $E_2$.

HUPFELD and BOEHMER give only *v.*1 to E, and divide the rest between $E_2$ and J, and the former writes as follows, *p.*67.

This difference of the sources reveals itself yet further in xxxvii, in some repetitions and contradictions first noticed by ILGEN:

(i) After Reuben's proposal to avoid the shedding of blood, *v.*21–24, has been accepted, Judah makes a proposal, *v.*26,27, for a like object, as if nothing before had happened, and as if the purpose was still to kill Joseph;[1]

(ii) After the *Ishmaelites* come on the stage, *v.*25, to whom Judah recommends the brothers to sell him, there appear all of a sudden, in the account of the sale, *v.*28, *Midianitish* merchants, mentioned now for the first time, to whom they sell him, and who also bring him to Egypt, *v.*36, while in xxxix.1 the *Ishmaelites* are mentioned again as those who brought him thither;[2]

(iii) Especially, after the brothers have taken him out of the pit and sold him, Reuben goes to the pit, *v.*29,30, and is confounded at not finding Joseph any longer in it, and his brothers also, to whom he communicates the fact, give him no explanation about it, and so must be supposed to share his ignorance; otherwise, they must have done all in his absence, and, further, must have wished to deceive him, of which no trace can be seen in the narrative, nor any reason or object for it.[3]

We may certainly help ourselves over these difficulties by forced assumptions. But, now that the difference of the sources has been clearly pointed out in xxxix, they cannot any more be mistaken here.[4] The whole explains itself by the fact of there being two distinct legends of the proceeding, which vary from each other in three points,—in the name of the brother, who has prevented the murder of Joseph and saved his life,—in the manner of his being brought to Egypt,—and in the person of the Egyptian to whom he was there sold.

According to the one, it was *Reuben* who saved Joseph's life by the proposal to throw him into a pit, from which he meant afterwards to rescue him; but, while they were eating their mid-day meal, some *Midianitish* merchants, passing by, drew him secretly out of the pit, and carried him to Egypt, and when Reuben came again to the pit, he found it to his horror empty (all which is quite intelligible). The Midianites, however, sold him into Egypt to Potiphar, an eunuch of Pharaoh and captain of the guard.

According to the other account, it was *Judah* who, in order to save Joseph's life, made the proposal to sell him to a caravan of *Ishmaelites* who chanced to be passing, whereupon he was brought to Egypt, where some unnamed Egyptian, xxxix.1, bought him of the Ishmaelites.

Both accounts give a complete connected story, and are plainly to be distin-

guished. Only in *v.*28 they are so put together, that a confusion arises from referring the verbs to the wrong subjects, which disappears at once when the different portions are separated. We have only to take out the clause, 'and they sold Joseph to the Ishmaelites for twenty pieces of silver,' and join it with the preceding *v.*27 to which it belongs,—and the verse will now run, '*And there passed by Midianites, merchants, and they drew-up Joseph out of the pit*,' (*i.e.* the *Midianites* drew him up, whereas in the present connection it can only be understood of the *brothers*,) '*and they brought Joseph to Egypt.*'[5] And this connects itself with *v.*24, where we are told that the brothers at Reuben's suggestion put him into the empty pit, or rather with *v.*25[a], 'and they sat-down to eat bread,' which probably belongs to this document, and perhaps will explain why the Midianites were able to do the business unobserved.[6] In this way there comes to light a fact hitherto unperceived, *viz.* that *the Midianites secretly carried away* (*i.e.* kidnapped) *Joseph*; and this is confirmed in the sequel by Joseph's words, xl.15, that he had been 'stolen out of the land of the Hebrews';[7] whereas the expression in xlv.4, that his brothers had sold him into Egypt, agrees with the other account.

And HUPFELD says the first account (with *Reuben*) must be due to $E_2$, and the second (with *Judah*) to J. For the second point he produces reasons such as those exhibited in our analysis, to which, of course, we fully assent. For the first point he merely alleges (i) that it *must* belong to $E_2$, because the other belongs to J,[8]—(ii) that it employs הֵבִיא, 'bring,' *v.*28[b], whereas the Jehovist uses constantly הוֹרִיד, 'bring down,' xxxvii.25, xxxix.1,—(iii) that it is also connected with the substance of Joseph's history in xl, &c., by using the expression 'captain of the guard.'[10]

284. To the above reasoning, however, we reply as follows.

(1) There is nothing inconsistent in *both* the brothers making their proposals in the *same* document. *Reuben's* suggestion, though intended by him to be the means of saving Joseph's life, was only to the effect that they should avoid *shedding his blood*; they were not 'to lay hands upon him,' but only to put him into the pit, and leave him there to *perish*. The purpose therefore was undoubtedly 'still to kill him,' but not with their own hands. The statement in *v.*21, that Reuben delivered him out of their hands, which seems rather to anticipate that in *v.*22, may mean that he, as the elder brother, took hold of him, and held him, as it were, in his charge, while talking to the others.

(2) We recognise fully this discrepancy, but suppose that the 'Midianites' belong to the original statement of E, and not, as HUPFELD suppose, to $E_2$.

(3) If the brothers were supposed to be really as much in the dark as Reuben, as to what had become of Joseph, there surely would have been some note express-

ing their surprise, whereas not a trace of this appears anywhere. It is easy to be understood, that they *did* tell Reuben of what they had done in his absence, of which he had no right to complain, as it was better to sell their brother than to leave him (as he had agreed to do) to die by starvation: and this seems rather to be implied in the sequel, xlii.21,22, though nothing is said about it here. At least, it is as easy to account for such a notice as this being omitted, as it is to explain why nothing is said about the surprise of the brothers at receiving from Reuben the account of his discovery that Joseph was not in the pit.

(4) There *is*, as we shall see, a difference in the sources, which is plainly betrayed —not, however, in xxxix, but—in xl; and there is also a difference here, but not (as it seems to us) of the kind which Prof. HUPFELD supposes.

(5) This suggestion is very ingenious: but it seems hard to believe that the story can have been written originally as HUPFELD supposes. Surely, something must have been said about the Midianites *seeing* or *hearing* Joseph in the pit, as they passed by. It could hardly have been stated so barely as here, 'There passed by Midianites, and they drew-up Joseph out of the pit.'

(6) It seems also impossible to account in this way for Joseph being carried off unobserved by a *caravan* of Midianites. These could hardly have been thought of as passing by without attracting the notice of the brothers.

(7) xl.15, as we shall see, is due—not to J, but—to $E_2$, who had before him (as we suppose) the brief notice from the hand of E, which has been replaced by the more circumstantial Jehovistic story in xxxvii, and may be here referring to it.

(8) All the difficulties of the case are met by assigning *v.*28ᵃ,36, to E, and the rest to J.

(9) J does use הֹבִיא of 'bringing down' to Egypt in xlii.20, xlvi.32.

(10) We shall see, in our examination of the sequel, that there is no force in this argument.

See especially on this point (301), where light seems to be thrown clearly, by the consideration of xlii.37, xliii.3–10, upon the composition of xxxvii; since in these chapters Reuben and Judah *both* come pre-eminently forward, and Judah's proposition is accepted, just exactly as here. But the above passages are undoubtedly (as BOEHMER allows) due both to the Jehovist.

285. HUPFELD, as has been said, does not profess to separate completely the sources in this part of Genesis: he only assigns certain portions to $E_2$ and J, and has not undertaken the difficult task of dealing with the rest. BOEHMER divides this chapter in a very artificial way between $E_2$, J, and the Compiler. After careful examination, we cannot assent to his scheme: but the following remarks of his deserve notice.

(i) The notice, that Joseph's brothers fed their sheep at *Shechem*, cannot be assigned to J for this reason, that they would certainly not have chosen as their pasture the neighbourhood of Shechem, which two of them, according to this writer, had so fearfully assaulted and sacked, and then left it as quickly as possible. Shechem is nowhere mentioned by $E_2$; and hence the express mention of it in *v.*12 must have the more significance. We can discover, however, no other object for which Shechem is here mentioned, than that may it appear less strange if Joseph and his brothers are found so far north as Dothan, while the father is still in the valley of Hebron, *v.*14. Yet in the account of $E_2$ it would be strange that they should have removed even so far as Shechem from their place of abode, which according to him (see below) was Bethel. It must be the Compiler, then, who removes the sale of Joseph to Dothan on account of the *name* of this place (דֹתָיִן, 'two wells'), and who makes the brothers arrive there from Shechem, near which town he had made Jacob purchase a property, xxxiii.19. *p.*258.

*Ans.* Very probably, Dothan was selected (by J, as we suppose) as the scene of Joseph's sale, because of the two notable 'wells' or 'pits' there: and then the brothers might be described as passing through Shechem on their way to Dothan,—which accounts for the singularity of the narrative of their movements in *v.*15–17. It is the *Jehovist*, who makes Jacob buy the property at Shechem, xxxiii.19; and, though he records the sack of Shechem, yet he mentions also the dreadful terror which it caused on all the cities round-about, xxxv.5; so that he may very well have represented them here as going boldly into this neighbourhood some ten years afterwards, (since Joseph was then *six*, xxxi.41, and is now *seventeen*, xxxvii.1).

(ii) According to $E_2$, Jacob's abode must have been rather at *Bethel*—[*i.e.* not at Hebron, as in *v.*14.] Thither God had commanded him to go, in order to fulfil his vow, xxxv.1: subsequently to his arrival there, xxxv.6, no change of place has been mentioned by this writer. According to E, Jacob is at this time, no doubt, with his father Isaac at 'Kirjath-Arba,' *i.e.* Hebron, xxxv.27. But, except *v.*1, nothing belonging to E can be traced in this chapter. Nor can the notice [about Hebron in *v.*14] have been derived from J: for with *him* Jacob's last-named resting place was the 'tower of the flock,' xxxv.21,22, *i.e.* Jerusalem. Hupfeld is wrong in saying, *p.*192, that 'Hebron here belongs most probably to the Jehovist, but without doubt is common to both sources ($E_2$ and J).'

*Ans.* We assign xxxv.1,5,—not to $E_2$, but—to J. But Boehmer's difficulty only exists for those who maintain the independence of all three sources. It seems to us, with Hupfeld, that 'Hebron' in *v.*14 does belong to J: but we hold that he has merely taken it from the last-preceding notice of E in xxxv.27.

(iii) Boehmer also notes, *p.*89, that in *v.*29, which he gives to $E_2$, we have in the expression 'rent his *clothes*' the word בְּגָדִים used, not שִׂמְלוֹת, as in xxxvii.34, xliv.13, which he assigns to J, who, he says, *p.*116, is wont to employ the latter word.

*Ans.* But J certainly employs the former word in xxiv.53, xxvii.15,27, xxxviii. 14,19, xxxix.12,12,13,15,16,18, all which passages Boehmer himself ascribes to the

Jehovist; and the only other passages in Genesis, where it occurs, are xxviii.20, xli.42, which we give also to this writer.

N.B. See also with respect to this Chapter (299) below.

## 286. xxxviii.1–30, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*1, 'and it came to pass at that time,' as in xxi.22($E_2$).

*(ii) *v.*1,16, נָטָה, 'extend,' (59.x).

(iii) *v.*1,2, 'and his name,' *v.*6, 'and her name,' (85.iii. N.B.).

*(iv) *v.*2,8,9,16,16,18, בּוֹא, 'go-in,' used of sexual intercourse (99.liii).

*(v) *v.*5, 'add and bear,' *v.*26, 'add to know,' (5.iv).

(vi) *v.*6, 'and Judah took a wife for Er his firstborn,' (120).

(vii) *v.*7,10, 'be evil in the eyes of,' (86.vii).

*(viii) *v.*7,10, הָמִית, 'put-to-death,' (97.xl).

*(ix) *v.*9, בִּלְתִּי, 'except,' (4.xii).

*(x) *v.*12, 'and the days became many,' (128.iv).

*(xi) *v.*12, נֹחַם, 'comfort,' (11.ii).

*(xii) *v.*13, 'and it was told to Tamar,' *v.*24, 'and it was told to Judah,' (137.ii).

*(xiii) *v.*14,19, סוּר, 'turn-aside,' (43.v).

*(xiv) *v.*14,19, בֶּגֶד, 'vestment,' (141.lviii).

(xv) *v.*14,19, 'the veil,' as in xxiv.65.

(xvi) *v.*14, 'and she covered herself with the veil';

*comp.* 'and she took the veil and covered herself,' xxiv.65.

(xvii) *v.*15, 'harlot,' as in xxxiv.31, *comp.* 'play the harlot,' 'harlotry,' xxxviii. 24,24.

*(xviii) *v.*16, הָבָה, 'give-here,' (55.iv).

*(xix) *v.*20, 'take out of the hand of,' (5.xv).

*(xx) *v.*20,22,23, מָצָא, 'find,' (3.xiv).

(xxi) *v.*21,22, 'men of the place,' (166.i).

(xxii) *v.*21,22, בָּזֶה, 'in this (place),' as in xlviii.9, *comp.* מִזֶּה (277.xx).

(xxiii) *v.*25, 'discern, I pray,' as in xxxvii.32.

*(xxiv) *v.*25,26, הַכֵּר, 'discern,' (180.xxiii).

(xxv) *v.*26, כִּי־עַל־כֵּן, 'for therefore,' as in xviii.5—see (3.xvii).

(xxvi) *v.*27, 'and it came-to-pass at the time of her bearing, and behold twins in her womb!'

E has 'and her days were fulfilled to bear, and behold twins in her womb!' xxv.24,—see (160.(4)).

*(xxvii) *v.*27, 'and it came-to-pass at the time of her travail,' (218.xxvii).

(xxviii) *v.*28, 'midwife,' as in xxxv.17.

(xxix) *v.*28, קָשַׁר, 'bind,' (216.xxiv).

*(xxx) *v.*29, 'at his drawing-back his hand,' (141.xlvi).

*(xxxi) *v.*29, פָּרַץ, 'break-forth,' (186.xii).

## 287. xxxix.1–23, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*1, 'Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh, captain of the guard,' refers to the E. statement, xxxvii.36, to which J adds the further description, 'an Egyptian,' *v.*1,2,5.

(ii) *v.*1, 'the Ishmaelites,' as in xxxvii.25,27,28ᵇ.

*(iii) *v.*1, 'buy out of the hand of,' as in xxxiii.19, *comp.* (5.xv).

(iv) *v.*2,3,21,23, 'Jehovah was with (אֵת) Joseph (him),' (163.x).

(v) *v.*2,3,23, 'making to prosper,' as in xxiv.21,40,42,56.

(vi) *v.*3, 'his master saw that Jehovah was with (אֵת) him';

*comp.* 'we surely saw that Jehovah was with (עִם) thee,' xxvi.28.

(vii) *v.*3,23, 'all which he is doing,' *v.*22, 'all which they are doing';

*comp.* 'all which Laban is doing,' xxxi.12:

$E_2$ has 'what ELOHIM is doing,' xli.25,28.

*(viii) *v.*4, 'find favour in the eyes of,' *v.*21, 'put his favour in the eyes of,' (13.xii).

*(ix) *v.*4, מָצָא, 'find,' (3.xiv).

(x) *v.*4,5,5,6,8, כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־(יֶשׁ־)לוֹ, 'all which was his,' (59.xxviii).

(xi) *v.*4,5,8, יֶשׁ, 'there is,' (141.xxxviii).

(xii) *v.*4,5, הִפְקִיד, 'appoint,' xxxix.4,5, xli.34—also $E_2$(xl.4).

(xiii) *v.*4,8,22, 'give into the hand of,' *v.*6, 'leave in the hand of,' *v.*23, 'see anything in the hand of,' (216.xvii).

*(xiv) *v.*5, 'Jehovah blessed the house of the Egyptian, on account of Joseph';

*comp.* 'Jehovah blessed me on account of thee,' xxx.27.

(xv) *v.*5, בְּנִלְל, 'on account of,' as in xii.13, xxx.27.

(xvi) *v.*5, 'all which he had in the house and in the field';

*comp.* 'what was in the field, and all which was in the house,' xxxiv.28,29.

*(xvii) *v.*6,12,13,15,18, עָזַב, 'leave,' (3.xviii).

(xviii) *v.*6,9, כִּי־אִם, 'except,' (186.xxiii).

*(xix) *v.*6, 'the bread which he was eating,' (186.xxxi).

(xx) *v.*6, 'fair of appearance and fair of form,' xxix.17—*comp.* $E_2$(294.iv).

(xxi) *v.*6, 'fair of form,' (59.xvi).

(xxii) *v.*7, 'and it came to pass after these things,' (133.i).

*(xxiii) *v.*7,12,14, שָׁכַב עִם, 'lie with,' (99.lv).

(xxiv) *v.*8, 'and he refused,' (281.xii).

*(xxv) *v.*9, גָּדַל מִן, 'be greater than,' (5.xviii).

(xxvi) *v.*9, חָשַׂךְ, 'keep-back,' as in xxii.12, also $E_2$(xx.6), D(xxii.16).

(xxvii) *v.*9,23, בַּאֲשֶׁר, 'because,' as in xxxix.9,23, *comp.* בְּשִׁגְגָם = בַּאֲשֶׁר גַּם, vi.3.

*(xxviii) *v.*9, 'do evil,' (171.xxxiv).

*(xxix) *v.*10, 'at her speaking,' *v.*13, 'at her seeing,' *v.*15,19, 'at his hearing,' (141.xlvi).

(xxx) *v.*12, תָּפַשׂ, 'handle,' take hold of,' as in iv.21.

*(xxxi) *v.*12,12,13,15,16,18, בֶּגֶד, 'vestment,' (141.lviii).

*(xxxii) *v.*14, 'see ye!' (63.xxi).

(xxxiii) *v.*15,18, 'lift-up the voice and cry,' (180.xl).

*(xxxiv) *v.*16, הִנִּיחַ, 'put-down,' (3.xi).
*(xxxv) *v.*17,19, 'according to these things,' (97.xxxix).
*(xxxvi) *v.*19, 'his anger was kindled,' (5.viii).
*(xxxvii) *v.*20, אָסַר, 'bind,' xxxix.20, xl.3b,5b, xlii.16,19,24, xlvi.29, xlix.11.
*(xxxviii) *v.*21, נָטָה, 'extend,' (59.x).

288. HUPFELD assigns the above Chapter to the Jehovist, except that, *p.*66, he considers that the description in *v.*1, 'Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh, captain of the guard,' must be an erroneous interpolation, probably from the hand of the Compiler, and drawn from the datum in xxxvii.36, which according to him belongs to $E_2$. He supposes that, in the narrative of the Jehovist, Joseph's master was only an ordinary unnamed 'Egyptian,' as he is called in *v.*1,2, who had a farm, *v.*5, and was married, *v.*7–19; whereas $E_2$ had represented him as an *eunuch*, 'high officer of Pharaoh,' 'captain of the guard,' and, as such, keeper of the state-prison, for whom 'farming' would have been unsuitable. The Compiler, however, has tried to combine the two stories, and, by inserting the clause in question, has wished to make one person out of two.

289. But then, according to HUPFELD'S view, there arises this difficulty, as he himself suggests, that Joseph's master, an ordinary Egyptian, is able to put his slave, for a private intrigue, into the *state-prison*, *v.*20—which seems most improbable. According to our view, the *Jehovist* has merely copied in *v.*1 the description of Joseph's master from the original E. datum in xxxvii.36. And he then makes him very naturally punish Joseph by immuring him *to serve as a slave* in the state-prison under his charge, in which, of course, there was a subordinate gaoler, who is mentioned as the 'keeper of the prison,' *v.*21,22,23, and who even took a fancy to Joseph, and made him a sort of 'turnkey' over the prisoners.

There seems to us nothing incongruous in a high officer of Pharaoh's having a country-house and a farm. And, though it is true that in the East (as BOEHMER shows, *p.*261) even eunuchs have harems, yet the word סָרִיס may here be used in the

general sense of 'court-officer,' as probably is the case in 1K.xxii.9, 2K.viii.6, xxiii.11, xxv.19, 1Ch.xxviii.1,&c.

290. BOEHMER, *p.*89, regards the description in *v.*1 as genuine, and that in xxxvii.36 as due to the Compiler: otherwise, he says, we should find in C($E_2$) both 'Potiphar,' xxxvii.36, and 'Potipherah,' xli.45, xlvi.20, whereas this difference of name is probably due to the difference of sources.

But he supposes that the Compiler has made the following two insertions in this Chapter, in order to combine the (supposed) two narratives of $E_2$ and J. He first interpolates in *v.*20 the words, 'into the place where the king's prisoners were bound,' which brings Joseph into the *state*-prison, the 'house of the captain of the guard,' as in xl.3; whereas J had only said, 'he put him into the house of the prison,' *i.e.* the *common* prison; and then he adds *v.*22,23—'almost in the very words of the *Jehovist* in *v.*3–6'—to explain how Joseph won the favour of the 'keeper of the prison,' *i.e.* according to BOEHMER, the 'captain of the guard,' and was set free from close custody, and put to service within the prison.

*Ans.* According to our view, *v.*22,23, *are* the very words of the Jehovist. The 'keeper of the prison' was the head-gaoler, under the direction of the captain of the guard; and Joseph was still kept immured in the *prison*, though at first employed in servile work within it, and ultimately put in charge with the *ordinary* prisoners, yet not, of course, with the *noblemen*,—the 'chief butler' and 'chief baker,'—who were presently committed to the same 'state-prison.' To their *service*, in the story of $E_2$, he was assigned by his master, the 'captain of the guard,' xl.4, and not by the 'keeper of the prison,' who appears only in J.

291. xl.1,3$^b$,5$^b$, *Jehovist.*

According to our view, *v.*1 has been introduced by the Jehovist, in order to make the transition from his story in the previous Chapter to the narrative of $E_2$ in *v.*2; and he inserts also *v.*3$^b$,5$^b$, to make the connection more plain.

*(i) *v.*1, 'and it came to pass after these things,' (133.i).

(ii) *v.*1, 'the butler,' 'the baker,'—not 'the chief of the butlers,' 'the chief of the bakers,' as everywhere in $E_2$, *v.*2,9,16,20,21,22,23,xli.9,10.

(iii) *v.*1, 'king of Egypt,' as in xl.1,1,5$^b$, xli.46,—not 'Pharaoh,' as always elsewhere; *comp.* 'the king,' xxxix.20.

(iv) *v.*1, 'sin against (ל) the king of Egypt';

*comp.* 'sin against Elohim,' xxxix.9,—also $E_2$(xx.9).

(v) *v.*3$^b$, 'into the house of the tower, the place where Joseph was bound';

*comp.* 'into the house of the tower, the place where the king's prisoners were bound,' xxxix.20.

*(vi) *v.*3$^{b}$,5$^{b}$, 'house of the tower,' as in xxxix.20,20,21,22,22,23, *comp.* 'house of your ward,' xlii.19,—not used by $E_2$ in *his* part of the story, though he says, 'who were with him *in ward* in the *house of his master*,' *v.*7.

*(vii) *v.*3$^{b}$,5$^{b}$, אָסַר, 'bind,' (287.xxxvii).

N.B. By comparison of *v.*3 with xli.10 it will be seen plainly that *v.*3$^{b}$ is (as we assume) an interpolation.

(viii) *v.*5$^{b}$, 'the butler and the baker of the king of Egypt,' as in *v.*1—not the '*chief* of the butlers, &c.'

(ix) *v.*5$^{b}$, 'the king of Egypt,' as in *v.*1.

(x) *v.*5$^{b}$, 'which were bound in the house of the tower' *comp.* xxxix.20, xl.3$^{b}$.

292. xl.2-23, *Second Elohist*, except *v.*3$^{b}$,5$^{b}$.

We suppose that $E_2$ inserted this narrative in connection with xxxvii.36, *before* the intervening Jehovistic passage was written. It will be seen that *v.*2 follows naturally after xxxvii.36, leaving no hiatus. And plainly it only repeats the statement of *v.*1, or rather, the later passage, *v.*1, repeats that of *v.*2.

(i) *v.*3,4,7, '*in ward* (בְּמִשְׁמָר),' as in xli.10,—not used by J in *his* part of this story, though he has אֶל מִשְׁמָר, 'into ward,' in another connection in xlii.17, and also 'in the house of your ward,' xlii.19.

(ii) *v.*4, 'and he ministered to them,' *comp.* J(xxxix.4).

(iii) *v.*7, 'who were with him in ward in *the house of his master*'—not '*in the house of the tower*,' as in J (xxxix.20, xl.3$^{b}$,5$^{b}$).

(iv) *v.*5,8, &c., פָּתַר, 'interpret,' פִּתָּרוֹן, 'interpretation,' xl.5,8,8,12,16,18,22, xli.8,11,12,12,13,15,15,—*nowhere else in the Bible.*

(v) *v.*7, מַדּוּעַ, 'why,' *comp.* J(xxvi.27).

(vi) *v.*7, הַיּוֹם, 'this day,' as in xli.9, *comp.* J(xlii.13,32, xlvii.23).

(vii) *v.*8, 'do not interpretations belong to Elohim?'

*comp.* 'Elohim shall answer the peace of Pharaoh,' xli.16.

(viii) *v.*14, 'it shall be well to thee,' *comp.* J(xii.13).

(ix) *v.*14, 'do mercy with (עִם),' (110.xxiv), *comp.* J(99.xxxviii).

(x) *v.*15, 'do anything,' *comp.* J(xxii.12).

(xi) *v.*20, הוֹלִיד, 'beget,' a form used elsewhere only by E(10.viii).

(xii) *v.*20, 'on the third day, the day of Pharaoh's birth (יוֹם הֻלֶּדֶת אֶת־פַּרְעֹה) he made a feast to all his servants';

*comp.* 'and Abraham made a great feast on the day of Isaac's weaning (יוֹם הִגָּמֵל אֶת־יִצְחָק),' xxi.8.

N.B. In *v.*15$^{a}$ Joseph says, 'Indeed I was *stolen* out of the land of the Hebrews,' which implies, according to HUPFELD and BOEHMER, that in xxxvii.28 the Midianites 'took-up Joseph out of the pit,' and carried him off to Egypt. According to our view, E had actually described, in a few words between *v.*28$^{a}$ and *v.*36, the fact of

the Midianites *kidnapping* Joseph, though probably in a more simple and obvious manner, which, however, has now been replaced by the more ample account of J. The words before us may refer to this last notice of E, which $E_2$ had before him.

Also in *v.*15$^b$, by the words which $E_2$ puts in Joseph's mouth, 'and also here I have done nothing that they have put me in this prison,' he does not mean to represent Joseph as an actual fellow-*prisoner* with Pharaoh's officers—which would imply a knowledge of the J. story in xxxix. But Joseph, by being merely *placed* 'with them,' *v.*7, xli.12, 'in the ward of his master's house,'(294.xiv.N.B.) might be taken by them for a *criminal*, and so is made to guard himself here against such an imputation (so HUPFELD, *p.*70).

293. HUPFELD and BOEHMER both ascribe this Chapter to $E_2$, except *v.*3$^b$,5$^b$, which they give to the Compiler, and not (with us) to the Jehovist; or, rather, they assign to him only the last clause of *v.*5$^b$, 'in the house of the tower,' apparently not having noticed that the expressions, 'butler' and 'baker,' in *v.*1,5$^b$, instead of 'chief of the butlers, chief of the bakers,' as everywhere else in the Chapter, indicates a difference of source.

BOEHMER also sees additions of the Compiler in the expressions, 'with him,' *v.*7, which he understands (without any necessity) as implying that Joseph was a fellow-*prisoner* with them, instead of being merely appointed by his master to serve them as a slave, and *v.*15$^b$, which he supposes (unnecessarily, as we have seen above) to refer to the Jehovistic story in xxxix.

294. xli.1–57, *Second Elohist*, except *v.*31,35,40-43,46,48–55.

This part of the story is shown to be due to $E_2$, though employing continually (as usual) the same formulæ as J, from its containing 'chief of the butlers' in *v.*9, and referring in *v.*9–18 to xl.2–23.

(i) *v.*1–7, with this double dream *comp.* J(xxxvii.5–11):

(ii) *v.*1, 'years of days,' *comp.* J(xxix.14).

(iii) *v.*1,2,3,3,17,18, יְאֹר, 'river,' *v.*2,18, אָחוּ, 'marsh,' *v.*8,24, חַרְטֻמִּים, 'soothsayers,' xli.45, צָפְנַת פַּעְנֵחַ, 'revealer of secrets,'—Egyptian words.

(iv) *v.*2,4, 'fair of form,' *comp.* J(59.xvi).

(v) *v.*8,11,12,12,13,15,15, פָּתַר, 'interpret,' פִּתְרוֹן, 'interpretation,' (292.iv).

(vi) *v.*8, 'and Pharaoh recounted to them his dream,' *v.*12, 'we recounted to him';

*comp.* 'and the chief of the butlers recounted his dream to Joseph,' xl.9.

(vii) *v.*8, 'and there was no-one interpreting them to Pharaoh';

*comp.* 'and there is no one interpreting it,' xl.8.

(viii) *v.*9–13 refers throughout to xl.2–23.

(ix) *v.*[illegible] 'chief of the butlers,' *v.*10, 'chief of the bakers,' as in xl.2,9,16,20, 21,22,23.

(x) *v.*9, הַיּוֹם, 'this day,' as in xl.7, *comp.* J(xlii.13,32,xlvii.23).

(xi) *v.*10, קָצַף, 'be angry,' as in xl.2.

(xii) *v.*10, Pharaoh's 'servants,' as in xl.20.

(xiii) *v.*10, 'and put me in ward in the house of the captain of the guard,' as in xl.3ᵃ.

(xiv) *v.*12, 'and there was there with us a Hebrew boy';

*comp.* 'the officers of Pharaoh that were with him,' xl.7.

N.B. The chief butler does not say that Joseph was a *prisoner*, but merely that he was 'with them' in the prison. Perhaps the Heb. should be pointed—not וְשָׁם, 'and there,' but—וַיָּשֶׂם, 'and he placed,' *comp.* xxx.41, *i.e.* 'he placed with us' as a servant; *comp.* Joseph's words in xl.15, 'they have *placed* me in this (pit) dungeon.'

(xv) *v.*12, 'servant to the captain of the guard,' as E and $E_2$ all along suppose, —whereas J represents Joseph as a prisoner.

(xvi) *v.*14, 'the pit' = dungeon, as in xl.15.

(xvii) *v.*14, 'change garments,' *comp.* J(xxxv.2).

(xviii) *v.*15, 'and Pharaoh said unto Joseph, A dream have I dreamed and interpreter of it is none';

*comp.* 'and they said unto him, A dream have we dreamed, and interpreter of it is none,' xl.8.

(xix) *v.*16,44, בִּלְעָדָי, 'beside,'—also $J_2$(xiv.24).

(xx) *v.*16, 'It is beside me; Elohim shall answer the peace of Pharaoh';

*comp.* 'do not interpretations belong to Elohim?' xl.8.

(xxi) *v.*17, 'in my dream, and behold!' as in xl.9,16.

(xxii) *v.*17–24 refers throughout to *v.*1–8.

(xxiii) *v.*21, בַּתְּחִלָּה, 'in the beginning,' *comp.* J(5.xxix).

(xxiv) *v.*26,27, 'the seven good kine are seven years, and the seven good ears are seven years,' &c.;

*comp.* 'the three branches are three days,' 'the three baskets are three days,' xl.12,18.

(xxv) *v.*33, רְאֵה, 'see' = provide, *comp.* J(xxii.8,14).

(xxvi) *v.*36, 'the seven years of *famine*' correspond to the 'seven years of *plenty*,' *v.*34—the J. phrase, '*good* years,' in *v.*35, not being referred to by $E_2$.

(xxvii) *v.*37, 'and the thing was good in the eyes of Pharaoh and in the eyes of all his servants';

*comp.* 'and it was good in the eyes of Pharaoh and in the eyes of his servants,' xlv.16.

(xxviii) *v.*37, 'all his servants,' as in xl.20.

(xxix) *v.*38, 'in whom is the spirit of Elohim,' refers to *v.*16, 'Elohim shall answer the peace of Pharaoh.'

(xxx) *v.*39, 'prudent and wise,' refers to *v.*33.

(xxxi) *v.*44, בִּלְעָדַי, 'beside,' as in *v.*16.

(xxxii) *v.*47 belongs probably to $E_2$ for this reason: after the full mention in this verse of the 'seven years of plenty bringing forth by handfuls,' it seems very unlikely that the writer of *v.*47 would go on in the same breath to speak in *v.*48 of 'the seven years *which were in the land of Egypt*'; but *v.*48 belongs certainly (as it seems to us) to J, and therefore we give *v.*47 to $E_2$.

(xxxiii) *v.*56,57, 'the famine was strong in the land,' see the J. phrase in (295.ii).

(xxxiv) *v.*56, 'all the face of the earth,'—never used by J, who says 'the face of all the earth,' vii.3, viii.9, xi.4,9, 'all the face of the ground,' ii.6, 'the face of the ground,' iv.14, vi.1,7, vii.4,23, viii.8,13.

N.B. It is possible that some small portion of $E_2$ has been lost after *v.*45, in which was described Joseph's carrying out the plan as laid down by *this* writer in *v.*34,36,—having been replaced by the statement of J in *v.*48, which corresponds to *his* previous note in *v.*35, and is followed by the J. sequel in *v.*49–55.

## 295. xli.31,35,40–43,46,48–55, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*31, 'and the plenty shall not be known in the land by reason of that famine afterwards,' expands and explains more fully the statement of $E_2$ in *v.*30, 'and all the plenty shall be forgotten in the land of Egypt.'

*(ii) *v.*31, 'for it shall be very *heavy*,' *comp.* (59.xiv);

*comp.* 'for the famine was *heavy* in the land,' xii.10;

'and the famine was *heavy* in the land,' xliii.1;

'for the famine is *heavy* in the land of Canaan,' xlvii.4;

'for the famine was very *heavy*,' xlvii.13.

(iii) *v.*35, J speaks here of collecting *all* the food of those seven good years; whereas $E_2$ in *v.*34 speaks only of collecting a 'fifth part' of it: so Ilgen, *p.*451.

(iv) *v.*35, קָבַץ, 'collect,' as in xlix.2.

*(v) *v.*35, בָּר, 'corn,' xli.35,49, xlii.3,25, xlv.23.

(vi) *v.*35, 'under the hand of,' as in xxxix.23, *comp.* xvi.9.

(vii) *v.*40, J places Joseph over Pharaoh's *house*, *comp.* xlv.8, whereas $E_2$ places him only over the *land*.

*(viii) *v.*40, 'over my house,' *comp.* 'over his house,' xxxix.4, xliii.16,19, xliv.1,4, *comp.* xlv.8.

*(ix) *v.*40, 'at thy mouth shall all my people kiss,' (180.xxv).

(x) *v.*40, 'only in the throne will I be greater than thou';

*comp.* 'there is none greater in this house than I,' xxxix.9.

*(xi) *v.*40, גָּדַל מִן, 'be greater than,' (5.xviii).

*(xii) *v.*41, רְאֵה, 'see,' (63.xxi).

*(xiii) *v.*42, סוּר, 'turn-aside,' (43.v).

*(xiv) *v.*42, בֶּגֶד, 'vestment,' (141.lviii).

(xv) *v.*42, 'and he *put-on* him *vestments* of fine-linen,' *comp.* '*vestment* to *put-on*,' xxviii.20.

(xvi) *v.*42,43, these particulars, the 'ring,' 'fine-linen robes,' 'gold-chain,' 'chariot,' &c. are quite in the style of the Jehovist, *comp.* xxiv.22,53.

(xvii) *v.*43 is out of place before *v.*44.

(xviii) *v.*43, 'and he (gave) set him over all the land of Egypt';

*comp.* 'I do (give) set thee over all the land of Egypt,' *v.*41.

(xix) *v.*46, 'and Joseph was a son of thirty years at his standing before Pharaoh'; it is this notice of time, as we have shown (184), which introduces great discrepancies into the story.

(xx) *v.*46, 'stand before,' as in xliii.15

(xxi) *v.*46, 'king of Egypt,' (291.iii).

(xxii) *v.*46, 'and he passed-over in all the land of Egypt'

*comp.* 'and Abram passed-over in the land,' xii.6;

'I will pass-over through all thy flock,' xxx.32.

(xxiii) *v.*48, קָבַץ, 'collect,' as in *v.*35, xlix.2.

(xxiv) *v.*48, 'and he collected all the food of the seven years';

*comp.* 'and let them collect all the food of the good years,' *v.*35.

(xxv) *v.*48, 'food in the cities,' as in *v.*35.

(xxvi) *v.*49, 'lay-up corn,' as in *v.*35.

(xxvii) *v.*49, בָּר, 'corn,' see (v) above.

(xxviii) *v.*49, 'as the sand of the sea,' as in xxxii.12,—also D(xxii.17).

(xxix) *v.*49, הַרְבֵּה מְאֹד, 'very much,' *comp.* xxxiv.12—D(xv.1).

*(xxx) *v.*49, עַד־כִּי, 'until,' as in xxvi.13, xlix.10—only besides in 2S.xxiii.10 (166.xxi).

(xxxi) *v.*49, חָדַל, 'leave-off,' as in xi.8, xviii.11.

(xxxii) *v.*49, 'he left-off to number, for there was no number';

*comp.* 'it (which) shall not be numbered for multitude,' xvi.10, xxxii.12.

(xxxiii) *v.*50, 'and to Joseph there were born two sons,' as in x.25;

*comp.* 'and to Seth there was born a son,' iv.26;

'and to Shem there was born,' x.21.

(xxxiv) *v.*50, 'which Asenath, &c.,' imitated (as we suppose) from $E_2$ in *v.*45.

*(xxxv) *v.*50, טֶרֶם, 'not yet,' (3.ii).

*(xxxvi) *v.*51, 'and he called the name of the firstborn Manasseh, *for* &c.' *v.*52, 'and the name of the second he called Ephraim, *for* &c.,'—derivations of the names Manasseh (מְנַשֶּׁה, from נָשָׁה, 'forget') and Ephraim (אֶפְרַיִם, from פָּרָה, 'be fruitful'), in the same form as in (3.xvi).

(xxxvii) *v.*51, 'all the house of my father,' *comp.* 'all the house of his father,' xxxiv.19, xlvii.12, 'all his house,' xlv.8.

(xxxviii) *v.*52, 'Elohim hath made me to be fruitful in the land';

*comp.* 'we shall be fruitful in the land,' xxvi.22.

*(xxxix) *v.*52, עֳנִי, 'affliction,' (86.viii).

(xl) *v.*53, 'which were in the land of Egypt,' as in *v.*48.

(xli) *v.54*, 'and the seven years of famine began to come' corresponds to 'and the seven years of plenty ended,' *v.53*;

*comp.* also 'before the year of famine came,' *v.50*.

(xlii) *v.54*, הֵחֵל, 'begin,' with כָּלָה, 'end,' *v.53*, as in xliv.12, (5.xxix).

(xliij) *v.54*, 'all lands,' as in xxvi.3: $E_2$ says 'all the earth,' *v.57*.

*(xliv) *v.54,55*, 'bread'=food, (186.xxxi).

(xlv) *v.54*, 'and in all the land of Egypt there was bread';

*comp.* 'and bread there was none in all the land,' xlvii.13.

(xlvi) *v.55*, 'what he saith to thee, do';

*comp.* 'what Elohim hath said unto thee, do,' xxxi.16.

296. HUPFELD observes, *p.*71 :—

The difference of the sources of this preliminary history of Joseph, xxxvii, xxxix, cannot therefore be denied. Also in the sequel traces may be found of the same, which ILGEN has already indicated, and *into which I cannot here go further.*

And he repeats the same on *p.*193. For the future, then, we shall have to compare notes almost exclusively with BOEHMER.

BOEHMER divides the Chapter between $E_2$, J, and the Compiler, giving, as usual, much to the latter. But he produces nothing to counterbalance the weight of the evidence exhibited above in our analysis. Two points only in his remarks seem to deserve particular notice.

(i) He gives *v.*43 to $E_2$, because the *Egyptian* names, he thinks, belong all to one writer, and Joseph's Egyptian name in *v.*45 belongs to this writer.

*Ans.* But BOEHMER himself, *p.*117, gives to J the Egyptian words יְאֹר, *v.*17,18, and אָחוּ, *v.*18; and it is not certain that אַבְרֵךְ, is an Egyptian word: it *may* be Aramaic; and J quotes in xxxi.47 an Aramaic word, and in x.26 an Arabic, *viz.* 'Al-Modad.' If 'Abrech' be Egyptian, it was probably a word in common use, when the king or his vizier went about the streets, and therefore might have been well known to *any* writer of Palestine. But, if $E_2$ and J are really the same person, as we suppose, the fact of both these using Egyptian words would be very natural.

(ii) BOEHMER, *p.*117, considers that נָתַן בְּ־, in *v.*48 is a sign of $E_2$, and compares with it xl.3,xli.10,—whereas J uses נָתַן אֶל, xxxix.20, 'in a like connection.'

*Ans:* The idea in xxxix.20, where Joseph is 'put *into* the house of the tower,' is *not* the same as in xli.48, where grain is 'put *in* the cities,' or, as it is explained, '*in the midst* of' them; and in xl.3, xli.10, the phrase is 'put in ward'—מִשְׁמָר not meaning 'a prison' or '*place* of confinement,' but the abstract idea, 'custody, confinement.' It would have been better to have pointed to xlii.17, where J (as we hold with BOEHMER) has אָסַף אֶל מִשְׁמָר, 'put-together into ward.' But J uses נָתַן בְּ־, in xvi.5, xxxix.4,8, &c.

297. xlii.5,6ª,7ª, *Second Elohist.*

*v.*5 is clearly not in connection with what precedes; it would be very tame for the J. writer, who has said in xli.54 that the famine 'was in all lands,' and in xlii.1–2 has described Jacob's family as suffering from it, to observe now—

'for the famine was in the land of Canaan.'

And again the commencement of this verse,—

'and the sons of Israel came in the midst of those coming,'

reads strangely after the notice in *v.*3 that—

'Joseph's ten brethren went down to buy corn in Egypt.'

We assign this verse therefore to $E_2$, in continuance of his story in xli.57.

(i) *v.*5, '*came* to buy among those *coming*,' refers to xli.57, 'and all the earth—they *came* to Egypt to buy.'

(ii) *v.*6ª, 'he was the seller to all the people of the land,' refers to xli.56.

(iii) *v.*7ª seems to be repeated awkwardly in *v.*8, which belongs certainly to J: we therefore give this to $E_2$ as the continuation of *v.*6ª, and suppose that it was followed originally by xlv.16.

N.B. In *v.*6ª, שָׁלַט, 'rule,' and its cognates, is only used elsewhere in the later Books, Ez.xvi.30, &c. The word שַׁלִּיט may be used here as a *foreign* word to express Joseph's office as vizier.

298. xlii.1–38, *Jehovist*, except *v.*5,6ª,7ª.

(i) *v.*1,2, יֶשׁ, 'there is' (141.xxxviii).

*(ii) *v.*2, 'live and not die,' xlii.2, xliii.8, xlvii.19.

*(iii) *v.*3,25, בָּר, 'corn,' (295.v).

(iv) *v.*4, 'lest mischief befal him,' *v.*38, 'should mischief befal him'; *comp.* 'should mischief befal him,' xliv.29.

(v) *v.*6ᵇ, 'the brethren of Joseph,' as in *v.*3.

(vi) *v.*6ᵇ, 'they bowed to him with their faces to the earth,' in partial fulfilment of the dream, xxxvii.10(J).

*(vii) *v.*6ᵇ, 'bow with the face to the earth,' (99.v) *comp.* (97.ix).

N.B. In *v.*7ᵇ, the Jehovist begins to introduce again the idea of the ill-feeling between Joseph and his brethren, and occupies with his narrative the whole interval from xlii.7–xlv.15.

(viii) *v.*7ᵇ,30, קָשׁוֹת, 'hardly,' *comp.* קָשָׁה, 'be hard,' (259.i).

(ix) *v.*7ᵇ,10, 'buy *food*,' xliii.2,4,20,22, xliv.25, *comp.* 'buy *corn*,' *v.*3: $E_2$ says simply 'buy,' or 'sell,' xli.56,57, xlii.5,6ª.

(x) *v.*8 repeats the notice of $E_2$ in *v.*7ª; and *v.*8,9, would have come better (*instead* of *v.*7ª,) after *v.*6ᵇ and before *v.*7ᵇ.

(xi) *v.*9, 'and Joseph remembered the dreams which he dreamed concerning them,' refers to their 'bowing' in *v.*6ᵇ, and to the dreams in xxxvii.5–10.

*(xii) *v.*10,11,13, 'thy servants,' (97.x).

(xiii) *v.*13,32,36,36, 'is not,' as in xxxvii.30—also E(v.24).

*(xiv) *v.*13,32, 'the younger,' *v.*15,20,34, 'your younger brother,' (47.viii).

(xv) *v.*13,32, הַיּוֹם, 'this day,' as in xlvii.23—$E_2$(xl.7, xli.9).

(xvi) *v.*14, 'this it is which I have spoken unto you';

*comp.* 'this is the word which I have spoken unto Pharaoh,' xli.28($E_4$)

'the word of Joseph which he had spoken,' xliv.2;

'the words of Joseph which he had spoken,' xlv.27.

*(xvii) *v.*15, מִזֶּה, 'from this,' (277.xix).

(xviii) *v.*16, 'send and take,' (180.xlvii).

(xix) *v.*16,19,24, אָסַר, 'bind,' (287.xxxvii).

*(xx) *v.*16,37, אִם־לֹא, 'if not,' (97.xxx).

(xxi) *v.*18, 'this do,' xlii.18, xliii.11, xlv.19—$E_2$(xlv.17).

(xxii) *v.*18, 'I fear ELOHIM'; *comp.* 'thou fearest ELOHIM,' xxii.12.

(xxiii) *v.*19, 'house of your ward,' *comp.* 'house of the tower,' (291.vi).

(xxiv) *v.*21,22, refers to xxxvii.21,22,28ᵇ.

(xxv) *v.*21,28, 'a man to his brother,' as in xiii.11, xxvi.31, xxxvii.19.

(xxvi) *v.*21,21, צָרָה, 'distress,' as in xxxv.3, *comp.* xxxii.7(8).

(xxvii) *v.*21, חָנַן, 'grant graciously,' as in xxxiii.5,11, xliii.29.

(xxviii) *v.*21, עַל־כֵּן, 'therefore,' (3.xvii).

(xxix) *v.*22, בֵּינוֹת, 'between,' as in xxvi.28.

(xxx) *v.*24, בָּכָה, 'weep,' (180.xli); *comp.* especially Joseph's repeated 'weeping,' xlii.24, xliii.30,30, xlv.14,15, xlvi.29, l.1,17.

(xxxi) *v.*25, 'and give them provision for the way';

*comp.* 'and he gave them provision for the way,' xlv.21.

(xxxii) *v.*26, 'and they lifted-up their corn upon their asses';

*comp.* 'and he lifted-up his sons and his daughters upon the camels,' xxxi.17;

'and the sons of Israel lifted-up Jacob their father in the wagons,' xlvi.5.

*(xxxiii) *v.*27, מִסְפּוֹא, 'forage,' (141.xxxix).

(xxxiv) *v.*28, 'their heart went-out'; *comp.* 'his heart fainted,' xlv.26.

(xxxv) *v.*28, חָרַד, 'tremble,' as in xxvii.33.

(xxxvi) *v.*28, 'what is this Elohim hath done to us?'

*comp.* 'what is this thou hast done to me,' xii.18,—see (4.xiii).

(xxxvii) *v.*29, 'Jacob their father,' as in xlv.25,27, xlvi.5; *comp.* 'Jacob his father,' xlvii.7, 'Israel their (his, your) father,' xliii.8,11, xlvi.29, xlix.2.

*(xxxviii) *v.*30,33, 'the man,' xlii.30,33, xliii.3,5,6,7,11,13,14, xliv.26.

*(xxxix) *v.*33, הֻנָּיִח, 'set-down,' (3.xi).

(xl) *v.*34, 'and ye shall trade in the land';

*comp.* 'and ye shall trade in it,' xxxiv.10,21.

(xli) *v.*36, 'me have ye bereaved';

*comp.* 'and I, as I am bereaved, am bereaved,' xliii.14.

(xlii) *v.*36, 'upon me have all these things been!'
*comp.* 'upon me thy curse!' xxiv.13, 'upon thee my wrong!' xvi.5.
*(xliii) *v.*37, הָמִית, 'put-to-death,' (97.xl).
(xliv) *v.*37, 'give upon (עַל) the hand of' = give in charge to, *comp.* (216.xvii).
(xlv) *v.*38, 'for his brother is dead, and he remains by himself';
*comp.* 'and his brother is dead, and he is left by himself,' xliv.20.
*(xlvi) *v.*38, לְבַד, 'apart,' (3.xiii).
(xlvii) *v.*38, 'should mischief befal him,' see (iv) above.
*(xlviii) *v.*38, 'in the way in which ye go,' (99.xii).
*(xlix) *v.*38, 'ye shall bring-down my grey-hairs with sorrow to the grave';
*comp.* 'ye shall bring-down my grey-hairs with evil to the grave,' xliv.29;
'thy servant shall bring-down the grey-hairs of thy servant our father with grief to the grave,' xliv.31;
'I will go-down unto my son mourning to the grave,' xxxvii.35.

299. BOEHMER agrees in giving almost the whole of the above Chapter to the Jehovist, but he assigns *v.*6$^b$,8,9,21-23, to $E_2$, and *v.*6$^a$,12, to the Compiler—not, however, as the result of an accurate analysis, but rather because his theory as to the composition of xxxvii seems to require that $E_2$ should contain such notices as these. I see no reason to distrust the correctness of the results above obtained, which give a consistent and intelligible story both for $E_2$ and J, without any such artificial *additions* or *omissions* by the Compiler as BOEHMER is obliged to assume. In fact, since it is the Jehovist who gives the account of Jacob's *deceitful* acts throughout, and especially the deceit practised on his aged father, xxvii, it is natural that he should here bring upon Jacob in retribution the deceitful practices of his own sons. And perhaps in Jacob's own utterance, xlii.36, 'Upon me have all these things been!' there may be implied a remorseful reminiscence of his own words in xxvii.12, 'I shall bring upon me a curse and not a blessing': *comp.* Rebekah's words, *v.*13, 'Upon me thy curse, my son!'

300. xliii.1-34, *Jehovist.*

This Chapter refers throughout to the preceding Jehovistic narrative.

*(i) *v.*1, 'the famine was heavy in the land,' (295.ii).

*(ii) *v.*2, 'and it came-to-pass as they had finished to eat the corn,' (97.xlvii).

(iii) *v.*2,4,20,22, 'buy food,' (298.ix).

*(iv) *v.*2, 'a little food,' *v.*11, 'a little balm,' 'a little honey,' (97.xiv).

*(v) *v.*3,5,6,7,11,13,14, 'the man,' (298.xxxviii).

*(vi) *v.*3,5, 'see the face of,' (218.vi): בִּלְתִּי, 'except,' (4.xii).

(vii) *v.*4, 'if thou art for sending our brother with us,' *v.*5, 'and if thou art not for sending';

*comp.* 'if thou art for prospering my way,' xxiv.42;

'if you are for doing mercy and truth with my lord, tell me, and if not, tell me,' xxiv.49:

$E_2$ has 'if thou art not for restoring,' xx.7.

(viii) *v.*4,7, יֵשׁ, 'there is,' (141.xxxviii).

*(ix) *v.*6,8,11, 'Israel,' as a personal name for Jacob, (260.i).

*(x) *v.*6, הֵרַע, 'do evil,' (99.xxi).

*(xi) *v.*7, 'is your father yet alive?' *v.*27, 'is he yet alive?' *v.*28, 'he is yet alive,' (146.viii).

(xii) *v.*7, עַל־פִּי, 'according to the mouth of' = according to, as in xli.40, *comp.* לְפִי, xlvii.12.

*(xiii) *v.*7, 'according to these words,' (97.xxxix).

(xiv) *v.*8, 'Israel his father,' 'Israel their father,' (298.xxxvii).

*(xv) *v.*8, 'live and not die,' (298.ii).

*(xvi) *v.*8, טַף, 'little-ones,' (241.xxxvi).

(xvii) *v.*9, עָרַב, 'guarantee,' as in xliv.32, *comp.* עֵרָבוֹן, 'guarantee,' xxxviii. 17,18,20.

(xviii) *v.*9, 'from my hand shalt thou require him';

*comp.* 'from my hand didst thou require it,' xxxi.39.

*(xix) *v.*9, 'all the days,' (4.xv).

*(xx) *v.*9, הִצִּיג, 'set,' (216.xx).

(xxi) *v.*10, לוּלֵי, 'unless,' as in xxxi.42.

(xxii) *v.*10, 'these two times,' as in xxvii.36, *comp.* 'this time.' (3.xv).

(xxiii) *v.*11, אֵפוֹא, 'then,' as in xxvii.33,37.

(xxiv) *v.*11, 'this do,' (298.xxi).

*(xxv) *v.*11,15,25,26, מִנְחָה, 'offering,' (5.vii).

(xxvi) *v.*11, 'balm, spices, myrrh,' as in xxxvii.25.

*(xxvii) *v.*12, אוּלַי, 'perhaps,' (86.ii).

(xxviii) *v.*14, 'El Shaddai,' as in xlix.25—also E(95.iv).

(xxix) *v.*14, 'and El Shaddai give to you (bowels) compassion';

*comp.* 'and Jehovah gave his favour,' xxxix.21.

(xxx) *v.*14, 'and I, as I am bereaved, am bereaved,' (298.xli).

(xxxi) *v.*15, 'stand before,' as in xli.46.

*(xxxii) *v.*16,19, 'who was over his house,' as in xliv.1,4(295.viii).

(xxxiii) *v.*18, עַל־דְּבַר, 'because of,' as in xii.17, xx.18—also $E_2$(xx.11).

(xxxiv) *v.*18,20, בַּתְּחִלָּה, 'in the beginning,' (5.xxix).

*(xxxv) *v.*19, נָגַשׁ, 'come near,' (97.xxxii).

(xxxvi) *v.*20, בִּי אֲדֹנִי, 'Oh my lord!' as in xliv.18.
(xxxvii) *v.*23, 'fear not,' (171.xiv).
(xxxviii) *v.*23, 'your Elohim and the Elohim of your father,' (193.ii).
*(xxxix) *v.*24, 'and he gave water, and they washed their feet';
*comp.* 'let a little water be taken, and wash your feet,' xviii.4(97.xv).
*(xl) *v.*24, מִסְפּוֹא, 'forage,' (141.xxxix).
*(xli) *v.*25,32, 'eat bread,' *v.*31, 'bread' = food, (186.xxxi),
*(xlii) *v.*26, 'and they bowed to him to the earth,' with reference to the dream xxxvii.10, as in xlii.6ᵇ, *comp.* also (97.ix).
*(xliii) *v.*27, 'of whom ye (said) spake,' *v.*29, 'of whom ye (said) spake unto me,' (163.vii).
*(xliv) *v.*28, 'thy servant,' (97.x).
(xlv) *v.*28, 'bend-the-head and bow,' as in xxiv.26.
*(xlvi) *v.*29, 'lift-up the eyes and see,' (63.xv).
*(xlvii) *v.*29, 'your younger brother,' (47.viii).
(xlviii) *v.*29, 'Elohim grant to thee!' (193.i);
*comp.* 'Elohim hath granted to me,' xxxiii.5,11.
(xlix) *v.*30, 'bowels,' as in *v.*14.
(l) *v.*30, Joseph's 'weeping,' (298.xxx).
(li) *v.*31, 'restrain himself,' as in xlv.1.
*(lii) *v.*32,32,32, לְבַד, 'apart,' (3.xiii).
(liii) *v.*32, 'is abomination to the Egyptians,' as in xlvi.34.
*(liv) *v.*33, צָעִיר, 'younger,' (47.viii).
(lv) *v.*33, 'one unto his comrade,' as in xi.3, *comp.* (55.ii).
(lvi) *v.*34, שָׁכַר, 'drink freely,' as in ix.21.
(lvii) *v.*34, 'hands' = parts, as in xlvii.24.

N.B. The statement in *v.*21, '*we* opened our sacks (in the inn), and behold each man's money was in the mouth of his sack,' does not strictly agree with the previous story in xlii.35, where they do not open their sacks, and find the money, till they have reached home.

301. BOEHMER gives the *whole* of this Chapter, as we do, to the Jehovist,—not a word to $E_2$, or to the later Compiler. And this fact seems to be a very strong confirmation of our own view, that xxxvii belongs almost entirely to J. For here we have the two brothers, *Reuben* and *Judah*, made prominent in the narrative, xlii.37, xliii.3–10,—*both* which passages BOEHMER assigns to J, as we do—exactly as they are in xxxvii.21,22,26,27. *Here* they both pledge themselves to bring home Benjamin in safety; *there* they both try to save the life of Joseph; and in each case Judah is the successful person.

But, if this be correct, *viz.* that both Reuben and Judah in xxxvii belong to the Jehovist, then certainly almost the whole Chapter belongs to him; and there is no room to suspect in it an interpolation of $E_2$, unless it be the notice about the Midianites, *v.*28[a],36, which, however, may quite as well be assigned, as we have done, to E. And, indeed, if they were given to $E_2$, it would be necessary to suppose that the whole of *his* account of Joseph's falling into the hands of the Midianites had been expunged and replaced by that of J,—which is the less likely, inasmuch as $E_2$ would probably have written a detailed narrative at some length, and not, like E, a brief notice only.

### 302. xliv.1–34, *Jehovist.*

(i) This Chapter refers throughout to xlii,xliii.

(ii) *v.*1,4, 'who was over his house,' as in xliii.16,19.

*(iii) *v.*1,4, 'over his house,' (295.viii).

(iv) *v.*1, 'put the money of each in the mouth of his sack':
*comp.* 'to restore the money of each into his sack,' xlii.25;
'and behold it was in the mouth of his sack,' xlii.27.

*(v) *v.*2, 'the younger,' *v.*12, 'the elder,' 'the younger,' *v.*23,26,26, 'your younger brother,' (47.viii).

(vi) *v.*2, 'the word of Joseph which he had spoken';
*comp.* 'the words of Joseph which he had spoken,' xlv.27.

(vii) *v.*4,6, נָשַׂג, 'come-up-with, overtake,' (220.xviii).

(viii) *v.*5,15,15, נָחַשׁ, 'divine,' as in xxx.27.

*(ix) *v.*5, הֵרַע, 'do evil,' (99.xxi).

*(x) *v.*7, 'according to these things,' 'according to this thing,' *v.*10, 'according to your words,' (97.xxxix).

(xi) *v.*7,17, חָלִילָה, 'far be it,' as in xviii.25,25.

*(xii) *v.*7,9,16,21,23,31, 'thy servants,' *v.*18,18,24,27,30,31,32,33, 'thy servant,' *v.*19, 'his servants,' (97.x).

*(xiii) *v.*8,9,10,12,16,34, מָצָא, 'find,' (3.xiv).

(xiv) *v.*9, 'with whom of thy servants it shall be found, he shall die,' *v.*10,16,17, 'with whom it is found, &c';
*comp.* 'with whom thou findest thy gods, he shall not live,' xxxi.32.

*(xv) *v.*9,22,31, וָמֵת, 'then he shall die,' (99.xli).

*(xvi) *v.*9, 'we will be to my lord for servants,' *v.*10, 'he shall be servant to me,' *v.*16, 'behold us servants to my lord,' *v.*17, 'he shall be to me a servant,' *v.*33, 'let thy servant stay as servant to my lord';

*comp.* 'and to take us for servants,' xliii.18;
'we will be servants to Pharaoh,' xlvii.19,25;
'behold us to thee for servants,' l.18.

(xvii) *v.*10, 'ye shall be guiltless,' *comp.* 'thou shalt be guiltless,' xxiv.41.

(xviii) *v.*12, 'begin,' 'end,' as in xli.53,54, *comp.* (5.xxix).

(xix) *v.*13, 'they rent their garments (שִׂמְלֹת),' as in xxxvii.34.

(xx) *v.*14,16, 'and they fell before him . . . and Judah said, . . . Behold us servants to my lord!'

*comp.* 'and they fell before him, and said, Behold us to thee for servants!' l.18.

(xxi) *v.*15, 'what is this work that ye have done?'

*comp.* 'what is this thou hast done?' iii.13, xii.18, xxvi.10, *comp.* xlii.28;
'what is your work?' xlvi.33, xlvii.3:

$E_2$ has 'thou hast done works that are not done,' xx.9.

(xxii) *v.*16, 'ELOHIM (193.i) hath found-out the iniquity of thy servants,' refers to xxxvii.18–28.

*(xxiii) *v.*18, נָגַשׁ, 'come-near,' (97.xxxii).

(xxiv) *v.*18, בִּי אֲדֹנִי, 'oh my lord!' as in xliii.20.

(xxv) *v.*18, 'let thy servant speak, I pray, a word in the ears of my lord';
*comp.* 'speak, I pray, in the ears of Pharaoh,' l.4.

*(xxvi) *v.*18, 'let not thy anger be kindled,' (5.viii).

(xxvii) *v.*19,20,26, יֵשׁ, 'there is,' (141.xxxviii).

*(xxviii) *v.*20, 'child of his old-age,' (116.iv).

N.B. Perhaps, the writer does not mean to speak of Benjamin as a 'little one' in this verse; but the expression קָטָן may only imply 'youngest.' Otherwise, it must seem very strange that the writer, if he thought of Benjamin as a 'little-one,' or mere child, should make Joseph send to him messes *five times as large* as to the others, xliii.34, and give him 'three hundred pieces of silver and five changes of raiment,' xlv.22. But certainly he seems hardly to have realised to himself that, even on his own showing, Benjamin (being only six years younger than Joseph) was about *thirty-three* years old at this time, and according to xlvi.21 had actually ten children.

(xxix) *v.*20, 'and his brother is dead, and he is left by himself';
*comp.* 'for his brother is dead, and he remains by himself,' xlii.38.

*(xxx) *v.*20, לְבַד, 'apart,' (3.xiii).

*(xxxi) *v.*20, 'and his father loveth him,' (277.ii).

*(xxxii) *v.*22,22, עָזַב, 'leave,' (3.xviii).

*(xxxiii) *v.*23, 'add to see,' (5.iv).

*(xxxiv) *v.*23,26, 'see the face of,' (218.vi).

(xxxv) *v.*25, 'return, buy for us a little food,' as in xliii.2.

(xxxvi) *v.*25, 'buy food,' (298.ix).

*(xxxvii) *v.*25, 'a little food,' (97.xiv).

*(xxxviii) *v.*26, 'the man,' (298.xxxviii).

(xxxix) *v.*27, 'ye (pron.) know,' (216.viii).

(xl) *v.*28, 'surely he is torn in pieces,' as in xxxvii.33.

*(xli) *v.*28, טָרֹף, 'tear-in-pieces,' (220.xlvi).

*(xlii) *v.*29, גַּם־אֶת־זֶה, 'this also,' (196.xxx).

(xliii) *v.*29, 'should mischief befal him,' as in xlii.4,38.

*(xliv) *v.*29, 'ye shall bring-down my grey hairs with evil to the grave,' *v.*31, 'thy servants shall bring-down the grey-hairs of thy servant our father, with grief to the grave,' (298.xlix).

N.B. It is noticeable that in *v.*27–29 Judah unites Jacob's words in xlii.36,38, with those supposed to have been spoken by him many years before in xxxvii.33 — thus showing that these passages are all due to the same author.

*(xlv) *v.*30, 'at my coming,' *v.*31, 'at his seeing,' (141.xlvi).

(xlvi) *v.*30,30, 'his soul,' (59.xxi).

(xlvii) *v.*30, קָשַׁר, 'bind,' as in xxx.41,42.

(xlviii) *v.*32, עָרַב, 'guarantee,' as in xliv.32, *comp.* xxxviii.17,18,20.

(xlix) *v.*32, 'if I bring him not unto thee, then have I sinned to my father all the days';

*comp.* 'if I bring him not unto thee, . . . then have I sinned to thee all the days,' xliii.9.

*(l) *v.*32, 'all the days,' (4.xv).

303. Here also BOEHMER is agreed in giving the whole Chapter to the Jehovist, except that he assigns to the Compiler the words in *v.*1, 'and put every man's money in the sack's mouth,' and in *v.*2, 'and the money of his corn,' writing as follows, *p.*268 :—

Afterwards the money plays no part in the story; but Joseph has his brothers brought back and detained solely on account of the stolen cup. And, if he wished to make it appear that he himself had only missed the latter, yet the steward, when the men opened their sacks, must have found the money in them; and, although he too might have had a command not to notice it, yet at all events they must have been astonished, especially as this now had happened the second time . . . The Compiler repeats, out of the account of the first journey, this secret restoration of the money—*for what reason, I cannot at all see.*. Perhaps it has no particular object, but is a half-mechanical repetition.

*Ans.* The *Jehovist* may have repeated the incident 'half-mechanically,' without any particular object; and there seems no reason whatever to call in the aid of the Compiler.

304. xlv.1–15, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*1, 'restrain himself,' as in xliii.31.

*(ii) *v.*1, נִצָּב עַל, 'stand beside,' (97.vi).

(iii) *v.*2, 'give-out the voice with weeping,' (180.xl).

(iv) *v.*2, Joseph's 'weeping,' (298.xxx).

*(v) *v.*3, 'is my father yet alive?' (146.viii).

*(vi) *v.*4,4, נָגַשׁ, 'come-near,' (97.xxxii).

(vii) *v.*4, 'whom ye sold into Egypt,' *v.*5, 'ye have sold me hither,' refers to xxxvii.28.

*(viii) *v.*5, עֶצֶב, 'pain,' (4.xvii).

*(ix) *v.*5, 'let it not be kindled in your eyes,' as in xxxi.35,—*nowhere else in the Bible—comp.* (5.viii).

(x) *v.*5, 'for saving-of-life has Elohim sent me before you,' *v.*7, 'Elohim has sent me before you . . . to save-life to you,' *v.*8, 'not you have sent me hither but ELOHIM':

*comp.* 'Elohim meant it for good . . . to save-alive much people,' l.20.

(xi) *v.*6, 'these two years,' *comp.* 'these two times,' xxvii.36, xliii.10

(xii) *v.*6, 'in the midst (קֶרֶב) of the land,' as in xlviii.16.

(xiii) *v.*8, 'ruler over all the land of Egypt,' as in *v.*26.

*(xiv) *v.*8, 'lord of all his house,' *comp.* (295.viii).

(xv) *v.*8, 'lord of all his house, and ruler over all the land of Egypt,' refers to xli.40.

*(xvi) *v.*9, 'haste and go-up,' *v.*13, 'haste and bring-down,' (141.xxxiv).

(xvii) *v.*9, 'thus saith Joseph thy son,' *comp.* 'thus saith thy servant Jacob,' xxxii.4.

*(xviii) *v.*10, 'Goshen,' xlv.10, xlvi.28,28,29,34, xlvii.1,4,6,27, l.8.

(xix) *v.*10, 'thou and thy sons and thy sons' sons,' *comp.* (19.xv).

(xx) *v.*10, 'thy flocks and thy herds and all that thou hast';

*comp.* 'their flocks and their herds and all that they have,' xlvi.32, xlvii.1.

(xxi) *v.*10,11, כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לְךָ, 'all which is thine,' (59.xxviii).

(xxii) *v.*11, כַּלְכֵּל, 'nourish,' xlv.11, xlvii.12, l.21.

*(xxiii) *v.*11, 'thou and thy house,' (22.i).

(xxiv) *v.*13, 'all my glory,' *comp.* 'all this glory,' xxxi.1.

*(xxv) *v.*13, כָּבוֹד, 'glory,' (59.xiv).

*(xxvi) *v.*14, 'and he fell upon his brother Benjamin's neck and wept, and Benjamin wept upon his neck,' *v.*15, 'and he kissed all his brethren, and wept upon them';

*comp.* 'and he fell upon his neck, and wept upon his neck a while,' xlvi.29;
'and Joseph fell upon his father's neck, and wept upon him, and kissed him,' l.1.

(xxvii) *v.*14, Joseph's 'weeping,' (298.xxx).

*(xxviii) *v.*15, 'and he kissed all his brethren,' (180.xxv).

## 305. xlv.16–18.

In *v.*17 *Pharaoh* commands Joseph to send his brethren back to fetch their father, and promises to give them 'the good of the land of Egypt'; whereas in *v.*9–11 *Joseph* has already done this—using, however, the phrase '*come-down* (יָרַד)

unto me,' *v.*9, not '*come* unto me,' as Pharaoh has done in *v.*18, and promising to settle them in the land of Goshen, and support them there during the remaining years of famine. In short, Joseph speaks to them in *v.*9-11, as if it was quite unnecessary to ask Pharaoh's permission; whereas here, in *v.*17,18, it is Pharaoh, who, on hearing that Joseph's brethren are come, at once volunteers his expressions of kindness. We suppose that *v.*17,18, followed originally xlii.5,6$^{a}$,7$^{a}$. It is possible that some intervening words of $E_2$ may have been cancelled, when the narrative of J was inserted. But it is not necessary to assume this: the connection is sufficiently complete without making this supposition. It must be presumed, of course, that Pharaoh had been told by Joseph some particulars about his brethren and his *father*, in the interval between the tidings of the arrival of the former reaching Pharaoh, *v.*16, and Pharaoh's saying, *v.*18, 'take your *father* and your households.' But *this* must be supposed on any theory as to the composition of the Chapter; since Pharaoh was not present at the interview between Joseph and his brethren in *v.*3–13.

306. xlv.16-18, *Second Elohist.*

(i) *v.*16, 'the brothers of Joseph have come,' refers to xlii.5, 'and the sons of Israel came among those coming.'

(ii) *v.*16, 'and it was good in the eyes of Pharaoh and in the eyes of his servants';

*comp.* 'and the thing was good in the eyes of Pharaoh and in the eyes of all his servants,' xli.37.

(iii) *v.*17, 'this do,' *comp.* J (298.xxi); $E_2$ also has 'I did this,' xx.5, 'thou didst this,' xx.6.

(iv) *v.*17, בְּעִיר, 'beasts,' nowhere else in Genesis,—instead of חֲמֹרִים, 'he-asses,' as elsewhere in J(xlii.26,27, xliii.18,24, xliv.3,13, xlv.23).

(v) *v.*17, טַעֲנוּ, 'lade,' nowhere else in the Bible—instead of נָשְׂאוּ עַל, as in xlii.26, *comp.* xlv.23,23, or עָמַס עַל, xliv.13.

(vi) *v.*18, 'come unto me,' for which J has 'come-down unto me,' *v.*9.

307. xlv.19–28.

Pharaoh's address to Joseph seems to have ended originally

with *v.*18: but J expands it in his usual way in *v.*19,20. $E_2$ only speaks of their 'lading their beasts with' corn, and going, *v.*17 to 'bring their father and their households,' *v.*18. But J introduces another command, providing also 'wagons' to 'bring their father' with, *v.*19; and he makes Joseph send to his father—

'ten he-asses carrying of the good of Egypt, and ten she-asses carrying corn and bread and meat for his father for the way,' *v.*23,—

besides supplying his brethren with 'changes of raiment' and 'provision for the way,' *v.*21. Clearly, the original command of Pharaoh as recorded in *v.*17,18—we suppose by $E_2$—did not contemplate any such largess as this. There is a sign also of an interpolation in the awkward juxta-position of the different *numbers* in *v.*19, 'and *thou* art commanded: this do *ye*.'

308. xlv.19–28, *Jehovist*, except *v.*21[a].

(i) *v.*19, 'this do,' (298.xxi).

*(ii) *v.*19, טַף, 'little-ones,' (241.xxxvi).

*(iii) *v.*19, 'your little-ones and your wives,' (241.xxxv).

(iv) *v.*20, טוּב־כָּל, 'all the good,' *comp.* 'the good of all, &c,' xxiv.10.

N.B. In *v.*20 we have 'let not your eye spare,' as in D.vii.16, xiii.8, xix.13,21, xxv.12, and nowhere else in the Pentateuch. But the phrase appears to have been proverbial, *comp.* 1S.xxiv.10,Is.xiii.18,Ez.v.11,vii.4,9,viii.18,ix.5,10,xvi.5,xx.17.

(v) *v.*21[b], 'at the mouth of Pharaoh,' *comp.* 'at thy mouth,' xli.40.

(vi) *v.*21[b], 'and he gave them provision for the way';

*comp.* 'and give them provision for the way,' xlii.25.

(vii) *v.*22,22, 'changes of garments,' (246.xiii).

(viii) *v.*22,22, חֲלִפָה, 'change,' *comp.* (218.xvii).

*(ix) *v.*22,22, שִׂמְלָה, 'garment,' (47.vii).

(x) *v.*22, the partiality expressed here for Benjamin corresponds to that in xliii.34, and connects this with the previous J. narrative; though the idea of giving these '300 pieces of silver and five changes of raiment' to Benjamin, whatever may be thought of Benjamin's age (302.xxviii.N.B.), seems rather incongruous, inasmuch as the whole family was coming down at once to live in Egypt, and Benjamin could have had little use for these things in Canaan.

*(xi) *v.*23, בָּר, 'corn,' (295.v).

(xii) *v.*24, 'in the way'=on the journey, as in xxiv.27,xxviii.20,xxxv.3,xlii.38.

(xiii) *v.*25, 'and they went-up out of Egypt';

*comp.* 'and he went-up out of Egypt,' xiii.1.

(xiv) *v.*25,26, 'and they came unto the land of Canaan unto Jacob their father, and told to him, &c.'

*comp.* 'and they came unto Jacob their father to the land of Canaan, and told to him, &c.,' xlii.29.

(xv) *v.*25,27, 'Jacob their father,' (298.xxxvii).

*(xvi) *v.*26, 'Joseph is yet alive,' *v.*28, 'Joseph my son is yet alive,' (146.viii).

(xvii) *v.*26, 'ruler over all the land of Egypt,' as in *v.*8.

(xviii) *v.*26, 'and his heart fainted'; *comp.* 'and their heart went-out,' xlii.28.

(xix) *v.*27, 'the words of Joseph which he had spoken';

*comp.* 'the word of Joseph which he had spoken,' xliv.2.

*(xx) *v.*28, 'Israel' as a personal name for Jacob (260.1).

*(xxi) *v.*28, טֶרֶם, 'not yet,' (3.ii).

309. xlv.21[a], *Second Elohist.*

We suppose this to have followed originally *v.*18, and to have formed the connection between the story of Joseph in Egypt by $E_2$ and the original Elohistic passage xlvi.6, &c. It might be thought that some words of $E_2$ may have been omitted between *v.*18 and *v.*21[a], to the effect that Joseph told his brethren of Pharaoh's words. But nothing is said of his doing this on *any* view of the composition of the Chapter; so that the Jehovist (or Compiler) apparently saw no difficulty in omitting all mention of it.

(i) *v.*21[a] appears to be the apodosis to *v.*17,18, and indeed comes in very awkwardly after *v.*19,20: for how could they 'do so' with reference to the directions in *v.*19,20, *i.e.* how could they either 'take the wagons,' which Joseph had to give them, or 'not regard their goods,' while they were still in Egypt? But the expression is intelligible as applied to their 'lading their beasts and going,' according to Pharaoh's words in *v.*17, and 'bringing their father and their households,' as described in xlvi.6, &c.

(ii) *v.*21[a], 'sons of Israel,' as in the immediately preceding context of *this* writer, xlii.5, 'the sons of Israel came in the midst of those coming.'

310. It is satisfactory to find that BOEHMER, whose view of the general tenor of the narrative of $E_2$ differs much from our own, yet in this Chapter assigns to $E_2$ the same portions that we do, though he adds something more, *viz.v.*3,15–19,21[ab],25[a],27[b], whereas we give only *v.*15–18,21[a]. The rest he gives to the Jehovist, as we do, except *v.*20, which he assigns to the Compiler. The following remarks of his, *p.*118, deserve consideration.

(i) 'The question in xlv.3, 'Is my father yet alive?' as ILGEN observes, cannot have come from that writer (J), according to whom Joseph has been already sufficiently informed on this point, xliii.27,28, xliv.19, &c.'

*Ans.* The stress is laid upon the words '*my father.*' Joseph had enquired about 'the *old man*,' '*their* father': he now, with a true touch of nature, asks tenderly about 'his father,' which involves the idea of his being also 'their *brother*.' They cannot speak to him for amazement and fear: but he goes on to speak of his father, as one who had been already, in fact, informed about him.

(ii) 'The *wagons* in *v.*19,21, remind us of the *chariot* in xli.43.'

*Ans.* If so, it rather supports our view, since we have assigned independently to J *both* these passages.

(iii) 'This do,' *v.*17,19, as in J(xlii.18, xliii.11), and 'and they did so,' *v.*21, as in J(xlii.20), [*comp.* J(xxix.28),] cannnot under these circumstances be decisive against these verses being assigned to $E_2$.

*Ans.* We agree with BOEHMER as to *v.*17: but the rest of the difficulty vanishes on *our* view, especially as we believe $E_2$ and J to be the one and the same person.

(iv) In *v.*27$^b$ 'the spirit of Jacob their father lived' reminds us of $E_2$ (xli.8), 'his spirit was troubled.'

*Ans.* True: but the expression 'Jacob their father' is found in the immediate context, *v.*25, which BOEHMER gives to J, and is only found besides in xlii.29, xlvi.5, the former of which BOEHMER gives also to J, as we do *both* passages; *comp.* also 'Jacob his father,' xlvii.7, 'Israel his father,' xliii.8, 'Israel their father,' xliii.11, 'Israel your father,' xlix.2, all which passages BOEHMER gives to J, as we do also 'Isr$^e$l his father,' in xlvi.29.

(v) BOEHMER assigns *v.*20 to the Compiler, because he sees in the expression, 'the good of all the land of Egypt is yours,' a later justification of the conduct of the Israelites in 'spoiling the Egyptians' at the time of the Exodus.

*Ans.* It seems unnecessary to suppose any such allusion to that 'spoiling' in the passage before us.

## 311. xlvi.1-5, *Jehovist.*

*(i) *v.*1,2, 'Israel,' as a personal name of Jacob, (260.i).

(ii) *v.*1, וַיִּסַּע, 'and Israel journeyed,' as in xxxv.21.

(iii) *v.*1, כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ, 'all which he had,' (59.xxviii).

(iv) *v.*1, the Jehovist shows a great desire to connect each of the patriarchs with Beersheba, *e.g.* Abraham, xxii.19, Isaac, xxvi.23–33; and so he makes Jacob start from Beersheba for his journey to Charran, xxviii.10, and here makes him visit Beersheba again before taking his last farewell of the land of Canaan.

(v) *v.*1, 'sacrificed sacrifices,' as in xxxi.54.

(vi) *v.*1, 'the Elohim of his father Isaac,' *v.*3, 'I am EL, the Elohim of thy father,' (193.ii).

(vii) *v.*2, 'and He said, Jacob! Jacob! and he said, Behold me! And He said, &c.';

*comp.* 'and he said, Abraham! Abraham! and he said, Behold me! And He said, &c.,' xxii.11; *comp.* xxii.1, xxxi.11, also xxvii.1,18.

(viii) *v.*3, 'I am (הָאֵל) EL,' as in xxxi.13, *comp.*xxxv.1,3,7.

N.B. As BOEHMER notes, *p.*270, 'This singular form with the article, [which occurs only with *this* writer, as in the above instances,] denotes the only True God': and so, no doubt, does the *plural* form with the article, v.22,24, vi.9,11, xvii.18, xx.6,17, xxii.3,9, xxvii.28, xxxi.11, xxxv.7, xli.25,28,32,32, xlii.18, xliv.16, xlv.8, xlviii.15,15.

(ix) *v.*3, 'fear not,' (171.xiv).

(x) *v.*3, 'for a great nation will I *place* thee,' as in xxi.18($E_2$), *comp.*xxi.13($E_2$), *comp.* 'I will *make* thee for a great nation,' xii.2; and observe that J uses frequently שִׂים, 'place,' in a similar connection, *comp.* xiii.16, xxvii.37, xxxii.12(13), xlv.8,9, xlvii.6, xlviii.20.

(xi) *v.*4, 'I will go-down with (עִם) thee,' (163.x).

(xii) *v.*4, 'and Joseph shall place his hand upon thine eyes';

*comp.* 'and Joseph fell upon his father's face, &c.,' l.1.

(xiii) *v.*5, 'and Jacob arose . . . and they lifted-up Jacob their father, &c. in the wagons';

*comp.* 'and Jacob arose, and he lifted-up his sons and his wives upon the camels,' xxxi.17.

(xiv) *v.*5, 'Jacob their father,' (208.xxxvii).

*(xv) *v.*5, טַף, 'little-ones,' (241.xxxvi).

(xvi) *v.*5, 'their little-ones and their wives,' (242.xxxv).

(xvii) *v.*5, 'in the wagons which Pharaoh had sent to carry him,' refers to xlv. 19,21,27.

312. HUPFELD pronounces no judgment on the above section.

BOEHMER gives only *v.*1[a] to J, *v.*1[b],5, to $E_2$, and the rest *v.*2–4, to the Compiler, together with the first 'Jacob' in *v.*5. But we cannot assent to his view. The expression in *v.*2—

'and Elohim said to Israel *in visions of the night*'—

is (as BOEHMER observes, *p.*269,) peculiar, and, in fact, it occurs nowhere else (as he says) in Genesis, nor (as we may add) in the whole Bible; so that no conclusion can be drawn from this fact with any certainty. The Jehovist, however, as we believe, describes such visions freely in xxviii.10–17, xxxi.10–13,24,29.

313. xlvi.6,7, *Elohist.*

*(i) *v.*6, 'and they took their cattle, and their gain which they had gotten in the land of Canaan,' (60.v).

*(ii) *v.*6, 'Jacob and all his seed with him,' (46.xviii).

*(iii) *v.*6,7,7, 'with (אֵת) him,' as a kind of expletive, (19.xiv).

*(iv) *v.*7, 'his sons and his sons' sons *with him*, his daughters and his daughters' daughters, and all his seed,' (19.xv).

## 314. xlvi.8-27.

HUPFELD seems almost disposed to give this section to E, and writes thus, *p.*34:—

Perhaps, however, to E belongs also the following precise account of the names of the sons of Jacob and their descendants who came with him to Egypt, *v.*8–27, with the superscription, 'and these are the names of the sons of Israel, who came to Egypt, Jacob and his sons,' *i.e.* of those who had 'come out of his loins, besides Jacob's sons' wives,' *v.*26, arranged according to the order of birth and the mothers, (quite in the same form as the sons of Esau, xxxvi.9, &c.), and with the statement of the total number, 70, including Joseph and his two sons. We should then have here the mention of Jacob's wives, which is wanting hitherto in E.[1]

But opposed to this are, (i) the fact, that a short notice with the same superscription and the same number recurs in E.i.1–5, which belongs undoubtedly to E,[2]—(ii) the form as *in* xxxvi.9, &c.[3]—(iii) the artificial reference to the number 'seventy' in *v.*26,27. Hence it looks rather like a commentary on E.i.1–5.[4]

*Ans.* [1] We believe that E gave the names of Jacob's wives in xxix,xxx: so that from our point of view we do not need this argument.

[2] This seems rather to *prove* than to disprove the fact of this list coming from E, as well as that in E.i.1–5: for the statement in the latter, that 'all the souls out of the loins of Jacob were seventy souls, and Joseph was in Egypt,' appears to be merely a *summary* of this.

[3] This again, from our point of view, gives the strongest reason for assigning the list before us to E, since we give to him xxxvi.9, &c.

[4] If the number 'seventy' in E.i.5 belongs to E, as is admitted, there seems nothing artificial in the names of seventy persons 'out of Jacob's loins,' being given in the passage before us.

BOEHMER gives this section to $E_2$, writing thus, *p.*118:—

*v.*8–27 (omitting the interpolations in *v.*12,15,20,26,) belongs to $E_2$; for here Benjamin at the time of their going into Egypt has ten sons, while the Jehovist, xliv.22,30–34, in the very same year, represents him as a child. The form of the table has a remarkable resemblance to that of the sons of Esau, xxxvi.15,16.

*Ans.* It is possible, as we have seen (302.xxviii.N.B.) that even J did not mean to represent Benjamin as a mere child; though he seems hardly to have thought of him as the father of ten children. But according to E, as we have shown (184) Joseph may have been about 70 years old, when Jacob went-down to Egypt, and Benjamin about the same age; so that there would be no incongruity in the latter being represented as the father of a large family.

315. xlvi.8–27, *Elohist*, except *v.*12$^{b}$,20$^{b}$,26$^{c}$.

The similarity between this list and that of the sons of Ishmael, xxv.12–16, and more especially that of the sons and *grandsons* of Esau, xxxvi.9–19, both which we assign to E, is a strong reason for presuming that this account of the children and *grandchildren* of Jacob is due to the same writer. This list, in fact, follows after and completes the list of *sons* in xxxv.22$^{b}$–26, just as the more extended list of Esau's descendants in xxxvi.9–19 follows after and completes the list of his sons in *v.*1–5. It will be seen that they coincide also remarkably in expression.

*(i) *v.*8, 'and these are the names of the sons of Israel,' (152.iv).

(ii) *v.*8, 'and these are the names of the sons of Israel, who came to Egypt,' repeated identically in E.i.1.

N.B. Since E.i.1 'belongs undoubtedly to E,' as HUPFELD observes, it appears that E uses the name 'Israel' of the *people*—the 'sons of Israel,' including grandsons, &c., *comp.* xxxvi.31—though only the Jehovist uses it of Jacob himself as a personal Proper Name (260.i).

(iii) *v.*8, 'Jacob's firstborn, Reuben,' as in xxxv.23;

*comp.* 'Ishmael's firstborn, Nebaioth,' xxv.13.

(iv) *v.*15, 'which she bare to Jacob in Padan-Aram';

*comp.* 'which were born to him in Padan-Aram,' xxxv.26.

(v) *v.*15, 'Dinah,' whose birth E has named (as we suppose) in xxx.21.

(vi) *v.*15,18,22,25,26,27, נֶפֶשׁ, 'soul' = person, (60.vii).

(vii) *v.*18,25, 'Zilpah (Bilhah) whom Laban gave to Leah (Rachel) his daughter,' refers to xxix.24,29, 'And Laban gave to Leah (Rachel) his daughter his maid Zilpah (Bilhah),' which we assign to E.

(viii) In *v.*20$^{aa}$, 'we have יִוָּלֵד אֵת, 'be born,' as in xxi.5; and in *v.*22,27, we have יָלַד, as in xxxv.26, xxxvi.5; but we can lay no stress on these as they occur also in J, the first in iv.18, the second in iv.26, vi.1, x.21,25, xxiv.15, xli.50, l.23.

*(ix) *v.*26, 'which went-forth out of his thigh,' as in E.i.5,—*nowhere else in the Bible*;

*comp.* 'kings shall go-forth out of thee,' xvii.6;

'kings shall go-forth out of thy loins,' xxxv.11.

(x) *v.*27, 'all the souls of Jacob's house';

*comp.* 'all the souls of his (Esau's) house,' xxxvi.6.

316. xlvi.12$^{b}$, *Jehovist.*

The notice in *v.*12$^{b}$, 'and Er and Onan died in the land of Canaan, and the sons of Pharez were Hezron and Hamul,' seems

to be an interpolation introduced, as we suppose, by the Jehovist himself with reference to his own interpolated story in xxxviii, Hezron and Hamul being here made to take the place of the defunct Er and Onan, with that disregard for the unities of *time*, which this writer has elsewhere shown, in his account of Jacob's age at his marriage (182-184), and Benjamin's at the descent into Egypt (302.xxviii.N.B.), and Joseph's sons (332.xiii.N.B.).

BOEHMER gives these words to the Compiler, and observes very justly, *p.*270:—

In this list, *v.*12$^{b}$ is an addition of the Compiler. In *v.*12$^{a}$ there were named, as the sons of Judah, Er, Onan, Shelah, Pharez, Zarah. These had all, according to this writer, gone with their father to Egypt. According to the Jehovist, however, from whom the Compiler derived the chapter concerning them, xxxviii, the two elder brothers had already died before the two younger were born. The Compiler notices this fact here, and, in order that the number might still remain the same, adds in two sons of Pharez instead of their two uncles . . . ILGEN had already bracketed *v.*12$^{b}$ with the remark, 'a gloss intended to connect what is described in xxxviii.' HUPFELD, on the other hand, *p.*163, supposes that xxxviii itself has been inserted here into the narrative, in order to explain this datum. But the later manipulation is very clearly to be traced in respect of this clause. Why should Er and Onan have first been reckoned at all among those who *went to Egypt*, if they had died already before that event? The original author would, under such circumstances, have left out Er and Onan altogether, and said 'Shelah, and Pharez, and Zarah, and the sons of Pharez, Hezron, and Hamul.' . . . While the Compiler, however, removes in this way one difficulty, he falls into another. For he thus requires us to believe (what he probably had not noticed) that *each* of the three husbands, Er, Onan, and Pharez, *must have married in his tenth year*, [and the last have had children born to him immediately in the due course of nature,] since otherwise Judah, who only married after Joseph had been carried to Egypt, could not have gone down with those two grandsons.

We agree entirely with the above, except that we regard the interpolation in question as due to the Jehovist himself, and not the Compiler.

317. xlvi.20$^{b}$,26$^{c}$, *Jehovist.*

If there is one J. interpolation in this list, there may very probably be more: and these two notices appear to be of this kind.

(i) *v.*20$^{b}$, 'which Asenath, daughter of Potipherah, priest of On, bare to him,' quoted from xli.50, *comp.* xxiv.47—also E(xvi.15, xxi.3, xxv.12).

(ii) *v.*26$^c$, 'besides Jacob's sons' wives,' is quite superfluous, and stands awkwardly in its present connection, as, of course, these wives were not likely to be reckoned among those who had 'gone-forth out of Jacob's thigh,' and the original writer would hardly have mentioned them, and, in fact, he makes no allusion to them when he mentions the 'seventy souls' again in E.i.5.

*(iii) *v.*26$^c$, לְבַד, 'apart,' (3.xiii).

We agree, therefore, with BOEHMER in regarding *v.*26$^c$ as an interpolation. But we see no reason for supposing with him that in *v.*15 the Compiler has changed the original number of Leah's sons and daughters from 32 into 33, and has also inserted in *v.*8 'Jacob and his sons,' and in *v.*20 the account of Joseph and his sons. Indeed, the latter of these suppositions is contradicted by the fact which BOEHMER himself admits, *viz.* that in *v.*22 Rachel's descendants are numbered as 14, which they would not be without *v.*20. Clearly, the number 33 in *v.*15 includes 'Jacob' himself in *v.*8. It may be observed that the numbers of Leah's and Rachel's descendants, 32 and 14, respectively, are just double of those of their maids' progeny, 16 and 7.

318. xlvi.28–34, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*28, 'Judah,' made prominent as in xliii.3–10, xliv.18–34.

*(ii) *v.*28,28,29,34, 'Goshen,' (304.xviii).

*(iii) *v.*29, אָסַר, 'bind,' (287.xxxvii).

(iv) *v.*29, 'chariot,' as in xli.43, *comp.* 'the 'wagons' in xlv.19,21,27.

*(v) *v.*29, 'go-up to meet,' (97.vii).

*(vi) *v.*29, 'Israel,' as a personal name of Jacob, (277.i).

(vii) *v.*29, 'Israel his father,' (298.xxxvii).

(viii) *v.*29, 'and he fell upon his neck and wept upon his neck awhile';

*comp.* 'and he fell upon his brother Benjamin's neck, and wept,' xlv.14, (304.xxvii).

*(ix) *v.*29, Joseph's 'weeping,' (298.xxx).

(x) *v.*30, 'this time,' (3.xv).

(xi) *v.*30, 'after my seeing,' *comp.* xvi.13.

*(xii) *v.*30, 'see the face of,' (218.vi).

(xiii) *v.*30, 'thou art yet alive,' (146.8).

(xiv) *v.*30, 'let me die now after seeing thy face, for thou art yet alive';

*comp.* 'Joseph my son is yet alive; I will go and see him before I die,' xlv.28.

(xv) *v.*31, 'his brethren and his father's house,' 'my brethren and my father's house';

*comp.* 'his brethren and all his father's house,' xlvii.12.

(xvi) *v.*31, 'have come unto *me* (Joseph),' *comp.* 'come-down unto *me*,' xlv.9: whereas $E_2$ makes *Pharaoh* say 'come unto *me*,' xlv.18.

(xvii) *v.*32, 'flocks and herds,' (59.xxii).

(xviii) *v.*32, כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לָהֶם, 'all which they have,' (59.xxviii).

(xix) *v.*32, 'their flocks and their herds and all that they have,' as in xlvii.1; *comp.* 'thy flocks and thy herds and all that thou hast,' xlv.10.

*(xx) *v.*34, 'thy servants,' (97.x).

*(xxi) *v.*34, נְעוּרִים, 'youth,' as in viii.21, (116.iv).

(xxii) *v.*34, עַד־עַתָּה, 'until now,' as in xxxii.4(5), *comp.* עַד־הֵנָּה, xliv.28.

*(xxiii) *v.*34, בַּעֲבוּר, 'for the sake of,' (4.xviii).

(xxiv) *v.*34, 'for every shepherd is an abomination to the Egyptians'; *comp.* 'for that is an abomination to the Egyptians,' xliii.32.

319. BOEHMER agrees with us in assigning all the above section to the Jehovist, except *v.*29ᵃ, which he gives to $E_2$, and the expression 'to Goshen,' in the same verse, which he assigns to the Compiler, merely because he has erroneously given the first part of the verse to $E_2$, who, however, never uses 'Goshen.' His words are these, *p.*273:

In *v.*29ᵃ $E_2$ relates that Joseph had inspanned and gone to meet his father—*to Goshen*, adds the Compiler, out of the preceding verse, whither, as J had said, who alone names the land of Goshen, Jacob had sent Judah in advance, to put things in order for the reception of his family. *A few words about the actual meeting* were also probably contained originally in this document.

*Ans.* From our point of view, there is no need of calling in the Compiler to help us, or supposing any part of the narrative of $E_2$ to have been omitted.

320. xlvii.1–6, *Jehovist.*

It is plain that neither *v.*4 nor *v.*5 can have been written by the same hand which wrote Pharaoh's words in xlv.17,18. For in *v.*4 the men say that they are come to 'sojourn in the land,' instead of saying that they are come at Pharaoh's own summons to live there. And in *v.*5 Pharaoh speaks as if he had heard nothing about them before,—'Thy father and thy brethren have come unto thee,'—without the least intimation that he had *sent* for them, and they were 'come unto *him*,' as in xlv.18.

(i) *v.*1–4, 'and Joseph came and told Pharaoh &c.,' refers to xlvi.31–34.

(ii) *v.*1, 'their flocks and their herds and all which they have,' as in xlvi.32.

(iii) *v.*1, 'flocks and herds,' (59.xxii).

(iv) *v.*1, כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לָהֶם, 'all which they have,' *v.*4, 'which thy servants have,' *v.*6. אֲשֶׁר־לִי, 'what I have,' (59.xxviii).

*(v) *v.*1,4,6, 'Goshen,' (384.xix).

*(vi) *v.*2, הָצִיג, 'set,' (216.xx).

(vii) *v.*3, 'and Pharaoh said unto his brethren, What is your wish? And they said unto Pharaoh, Thy servants are shepherds, both we and our father,' repeated from xlvi.33,34.

*(viii) *v.*3,4,4, 'thy servants,' (97.x).

(ix) *v.*4, 'the famine is *heavy* in the land of Canaan,' (295.ii).

(x) *v.*6, 'the land of Egypt is before thee,' (63.xiii).

(xi) *v.*6, יֶשׁ, 'there is,' (141.xxxviii).

321. xlvii.7–11.

Here appears to be a fragment of the original Elohistic story. According to the Jehovist, Jacob was in the land of Goshen, xlvi.29, xlvii.1, from which Joseph 'went up' in his chariot to Pharaoh, who therefore lived at some distance: hence he does not present *all* his brethren to Pharaoh, but only five of them, who may be supposed to have followed him on foot. But, if the *same* writer had meant to present the aged father also before Pharaoh, we should expect that something would have been said about his going, and the way in which he was to go, in xlvi. 31–34, where Joseph only seems to contemplate his brothers or some of them going. Accordingly, we find here again some strong traces of the style of E. And we may observe that the expressions in *v.*7—

'and Joseph *brought* Jacob his father, and *made-him-stand* before Pharaoh'—

are different from those in *v.*2,—

'he *took* five of his brethren, and *set* them before Pharaoh'—

though this is not in itself of much importance.

322. xlvii.7–11, *Elohist*, except *v.*11ᶜᵉ.

(i) *v.*7,10, 'and Jacob blessed Pharaoh'; *comp.* Isaac's blessing Jacob, xxviii.1; but J has similar formulæ, xxiv.60, xxvii.23,27, &c.

*(ii) *v.*8, 'the days of the years of thy life,' *v.*9, 'the days of the years of my sojournings,' 'the days of the years of my life,' 'the days of the years of the life of my fathers,' (139.iii).

*(iii) *v.*9, 'years of my sojournings,' 'days of their sojournings,' (95.xxii).

*(iv) *v.*9, מְאַת, 'hundred,' (10.ix).

*(v) *v.*9, the 130 years of Jacob's life are again referred to in xlvii.28.

*(vi) *v.*11, אֲחֻזָּה, 'possession,' (95.xxiii).

(vii) *v.*11, 'the land of Rameses,' whereas hitherto we have always had the 'land of Goshen.'

It would be strange, as BOEHMER observes, *p.*23, that the *same* writer, who had just before recorded Pharaoh's command to settle them 'in the land of *Goshen*,' should instantly go on to tell us that Pharaoh settled them 'in the land of *Rameses, as Pharaoh commanded*': though, of course, the two designations must have been in some sense equivalent, and in a different context there would have been nothing strange in the same writer using a different name. The fact is however, that the Jehovist uses *always* throughout Genesis the 'land of Goshen.'

323. xlvii.11$^{cc}$, *Jehovist.*

We suppose that the Jehovist, when writing in *v.*6, 'settle thy father and thy brethren,' had before him the words of E in *v.*11, 'and he settled his father and his brethren.' But, whereas E only added 'and gave them a possession in the land of Egypt in the land of Rameses,' J has repeated in *v.*11$^{c}$ his own expression in *v.*6, 'in the best of the land,' and has added *v.*11$^{c}$, 'as Pharaoh commanded,' referring to the words which he himself had put into Pharaoh's mouth in *v.*6.

HUPFELD, *p.*34, gives nothing of this passage to E. BOEHMER, however, gives to E *v.*11$^{b}$, translating, 'and one gave them a possession in the land of Egypt,' *comp.* 'one told,' xlviii.2: the rest he gives to the Jehovist, who, however, has nowhere, in the passages which BOEHMER gives him out of the rest of Genesis, used formulæ such as some of those above noted (322.ii, iii,iv,v,vi).

324. xlvii.12–27$^{a}$, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*12, כִּלְכֵּל, 'nourish,' (304.xxii).

(ii) *v.*12, 'and Joseph nourished his father &c.';

*comp.* 'I will nourish you and your little-ones,' l.21.

(iii) *v.*12, 'his brethren and all his father's house,' (348.xv).

(iv) *v.*12, לְפִי, 'according to,' (300.xii).

*(v) *v.*12,24, טַף, 'little-ones,' (241.xxxvi).

(vi) *v.*13, 'and bread there was none in all the land';

*comp.* 'and in all the land of Egypt there was bread,' xli.54.

*(vii) *v.*13,15,17,17,19, 'bread' = food, (186.xxxi).
*(viii) *v.*13, 'for the famine was very *heavy*,' (295.ii).
(ix) *v.*14, לָקַט, 'collect,' as in xxxi.46.
*(x) *v.*14, מָצָא, 'find,' (3.xiv)
*(xi) *v.*15, הָבָה, *v.*16, הָבוּ, 'give here,' (55.iv).
(xii) *v.*17, 'cattle of flocks and cattle of herds,' as in xxvi.14—only besides in Eccles.ii.7,2Ch.xxxii.29.
(xiii) *v.*17, נָהַל, 'lead-on,' *comp.* xxxiii.14.
*(xiv) *v.*18, בִּלְתִּי, 'except,' (4.xii).
*(xv) *v.*19,25, 'we will be servants to Pharaoh,' (302.xvi).
*(xvi) *v.*19, 'live and not die,' (298.ii).
(xvii) *v.*22, עַל־כֵּן, 'therefore,' (3.xvii).
(xviii) *v.*23, הַיּוֹם, 'this day,' (292.vi).
(xix) *v.*24, 'hands' = parts, as in xliii.34.
*(xx) *v.*25, 'find favour in the eyes of,' (13.xii).
*(xxi) *v.*26, 'unto this day,' (99.lviii).
*(xxii) *v.*26, לָבַד, 'apart,' (3.xiii).
*(xxiii) *v.*27[a], 'Israel,' as a personal name of Jacob, (277.i)
*(xxiv) *v.*27[a], 'Goshen,' (304.xviii).
(xxv) *v.*27[a], 'and they got-possessions in it';
*comp.* 'and got-possessions in it,' xxxiv.10.

N.B. By using וַיֵּאָחֲזוּ, 'get a possession,' in *v.*27[a] the Jehovist seems to be taking up again the thread of E's story in *v.*11[bd], 'and he gave them a *possession* in the land of Egypt in the land of Rameses.'

325. BOEHMER, *p.*273–276, gives the above to the later Compiler in Josiah's time, except *v.*27[a], which he assigns to the Jehovist. But he does this chiefly on external grounds, because, by reference to the statements about Egyptian matters in Herodotus, ii.109, &c., he thinks this passage could not have been written at so early an age as that at which he believes $E_2$ and J to have lived. But this assumes that the accounts here given are accurate and true accounts of Egyptian matters, which is by no means certain: and at any rate we are not justified in abandoning on such grounds the results of our own analysis. HUPFELD says nothing very definite about this passage: see his remarks quoted below (328).

326. xlvii.27[b],28, *Elohist.*

*v.*27[b] appears to be the continuation of the E. story in *v.*11[abd].

*(i) *v.*27$^{b}$, פְּרָה וְרִבָּה, 'fructify and multiply,' (1.iv).

(ii) *v.*27$^{b}$, וַיִּרְבּוּ מְאֹד, 'and they multiplied greatly,' as in vii.18$^{a}$.

(iii) *v.*28, 'and Jacob lived in the land of Egypt 17 years';

*comp.* the formulæ in v, 'and Adam *lived* 130 years,' 'and Seth *lived* 105 years,' &c.

N.B. This notice of Jacob's living 17 years in Egypt is unmeaning, except in connection with the '130 years' of *v.*9, from which is derived the '147 years' of *v.*28. Hence *v.*9 must be, it would seem, a portion of the E. document, though neither HUPFELD nor BOEHMER has so judged.

*(iv) *v.*28, 'days of the years of the life of,' (139.iii).

*(v) *v.*28, מְאַת, 'hundred,' (10.ix).

HUPFELD gives *v.*27,28, to E, *p.*84; but BOEHMER'S view agrees here with our own.

## 327. xlvii. 29–31, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*29, 'and Israel's days drew near for dying';

*comp.* 'the days of my father's mourning will draw near,' xxvii.41.

*(ii) *v.*29,31, 'Israel,' as a personal name of Jacob, (277.i).

(iii) *v.*29, 'and he called to his son to Joseph,' implies Jacob's fondness for Joseph, as in xxxvii.3,4.

*(iv) *v.*29, 'if, I pray, I have found favour in thine eyes,' (97.xi, 13.xii).

*(v) *v.*29, מָצָא, 'find,' (3.xiv).

(vi) *v.*29, 'place, I pray, thy hand beneath my thigh,' as in xxiv.2.

*(vii) *v.*29, 'mercy and truth,' (141.xliii).

(viii) *v.*29, 'do mercy with (עִם)' (99.xxxviii).

*(ix) *v.*29, אַל־נָא, 'let not, I pray,' (63.xii).

(x) *v.*30, 'their burying-place,' contrasts remarkably with E's careful descriptions of the grave of Machpelah (139.viii).

(xi) *v.*31, 'swear to me,' as in xxi.23, xxv.33.

(xii) *v.*31, 'and he said, Swear to me and he sware to him';

*comp.* 'and Jacob said, Swear to me this day, and he sware to him,' xxv.33.

(xiii) *v.*31, 'and Israel bowed-himself,' *i.e.* in adoration;

*comp.* 'and the man bowed-himself,' xxiv.26.

N.B. In *v.*31 it should be rendered undoubtedly, as in the E.V., 'and Israel bowed-himself upon the head of his bed,' *comp.* xlviii.2, 1K.i.47,—not 'leaning upon the head of his staff,' as we find it in Heb.xi.21, where it is adopted from the LXX, who read הַמַּטֶּה, 'the staff,' for הַמִּטָּה, 'the bed,' in xlvii.31, though they did *not* read this in the immediate context, xlviii.2.

328. BOEHMER again gives the above to the Compiler—chiefly because, by assigning it to the Jehovist, he would seriously compromise his other conclusions. He writes thus, *p.*276:—

The narrative here refers to facts, which only E has narrated, about Abraham's family burial-place at Machpelah, where Abraham and Isaac were buried. The style reminds us frequently of the Jehovist. But this double relationship to E and J shows here, as elsewhere, the Compiler who is acquainted with both.

*Ans.* The loose reference to the cave of Machpelah, and to the fact that both Abraham and Isaac were buried there (in the words '*their* burying-place'), implies, as it seems to us, that the Jehovist had before him the Elohistic document, and was merely writing to supplement it. It seems, in fact, to militate very strongly—if not decisively—against the theory, that he wrote an original, independent, document.

HUPFELD, however, gives this section without hesitation to the Jehovist, as we do, writing as follows, *p.*161,162 :—

From the arrival at Succoth onward, xxxiii.17, the further history of Jacob on the return from Mesopotamia is given from Elohistic sources, and the Jehovistic forsakes us here, to crop-out again further on, when the sons of Jacob have come upon the foreground. Yet even here, up to the present time, only unconnected fragments of the Jehovist admit of being recognised, but no continuous narrative, with the exception of the close of the history of Jacob, xlvii.29–31, xlix.1–28, l.1–11. In the history of Joseph the results of critical enquiry are up to the present time most unsatisfactory; and I have not succeeded myself as yet in detecting a certain separation of the sources in the apparently unbroken context of the romantic and in part tragical complication and development of the proceedings in Egypt. And yet, in the story of the transactions between Joseph and his brothers, which lead to the removal of the family to Egypt, xlii–xlvii, are not only to be discerned distinct traces of variations and parallelisms which correspond to those already pointed out at the commencement, xxxvii,xxxix, but the narrative exhibits generally, setting aside the constant use of the name 'Elohim,' a character which reminds us more of the Jehovist, than of the second Elohist; although, by reason of the close relationship of these two younger sources, the task of distinguishing between them is, for want of external indications, much more difficult than that of separating them from the primary document. I do not, then, abandon the hope that upon further investigation, and on the principles of the distinct characteristics already discovered, this hitherto dark passage may still be cleared up, as so many others have received an unexpected light.

*Ans.* We trust that we have succeeded in some measure in clearing up the difficulty, which HUPFELD finds in the history of Joseph; but this must be left to the judgment of others. Our conclusions, however, if accepted, will tend, as we have seen, to decide negatively the question, as to whether there was more than one original independent narrative, *viz.* that of the Elohist, which was first supplemented by $E_2$, then by J, and finally by the later (Deuteronomistic) Editor.

329. xlviii.1,2, *Jehovist.*

These words seem intended merely to form a connecting link for introducing the Elohistic passage, *v.*3–7.

*(i) *v.*1, 'and it came to pass after these things,' as in xxii.1,20, xxxix.7, xl.1.

(ii) *v.*1, *Manasseh* put first, according to his age: *contr.* the E. notice in *v.*5, where *Ephraim* is put first.

*(iii) *v.*2, 'Israel,' as a personal name of Jacob, (277.i).

(iv) *v.*2, מִטָּה, 'bed,' as in xlvii.31.

Both HUPFELD and BOEHMER give the above, as we do, to J.

330. xlviii.3–7, *Elohist.*

These words seem to follow naturally after xlvii.28, though they have been separated by the Jehovistic interpolation.

(i) *v.*3, 'Jacob,' as in xlvii.28: the change to this name from 'Israel' in *v.*2 *suggests* a change of authorship, though it does not decide for it, since J uses 'Jacob,' as well as 'Israel,' and even in close contiguity, as in xlv.27,28,xlvi.1,2,5. E, however, uses only 'Jacob,' and the return to 'Israel' in *v.*8 cuts off *v.*3–7 as *possibly* due to this writer.

(ii) *v.*3,4, contains almost a verbal repetition of xxxv.9,11,12, yet in such a way as to show that the original writer is here quoting – and modifying, as he quotes—his own former expressions; whereas a later Compiler—(to whom alone this passage could be given, if not to E)—would have been more likely to repeat them as literally as possible:—

| xxxv.9,11,12. | xlviii.3,4. |
|---|---|
| 'El Shaddai appeared unto Jacob at his coming out of Padan-Aram, and blessed him . . . . | 'El Shaddai appeared unto me at Luz in the land of Canaan, and blessed me, |
| and Elohim said unto him . . . . fructify and multiply; | and said unto me, Behold! I fructify thee and multiply |
| a nation and a company of *nations* shall be out of thee . . . and the land, which I gave to Abraham and Isaac, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed after thee will I give the land.' | thee; and I set thee for a company of *peoples*; and I give this land to thy seed after thee, an everlasting possession.' |

N.B. Besides other variations, it will be seen that the original promise does *not* contain the expression 'an everlasting possession,' which is a decidedly E. phrase, and might, of course, have been introduced in the later passage by the original writer, but, probably, *not* by a later editor.

(iii) *v.*3, 'and He blessed me,' (1.v).

*(iv) *v.*4, פָּרָה וְרִבָּה, 'fructify and multiply,' (1.iv).

*(v) *v.*4, 'I give thee for a company of peoples,' (95.xii).

*(vi) *v.*4, 'I give this land to thy seed after thee,' (95.xxi).

*(vii) *v.*4, 'thy seed after thee,' (46.xviii).

*(viii) *v.*4, 'everlasting possession,' (46.xxvi).

*(ix) *v.*4, אֲחֻזָּה, 'possession,' (95.xxiii).

(x) *v.5*, 'thy two sons, who were born to thee in the land of Egypt, Ephraim and Manasseh,' refers to xlvi.20$^{ac}$.

(xi) *v.5*, 'Ephraim and Manasseh'—Ephraim put before Manasseh, (in accordance, no doubt, with the predominant power of the tribe in the writer's time,) by which is anticipated the J. insertion, which follows, of the formal recognition of Ephraim's superiority by Jacob, *v.*14,19,20. In like manner, E inverts the order of the birth in the case of Ishmael and Isaac in xxv.9.

*Contr.* the J. passage, *v.*1, where *Manassch* is put first, in preparation for *v.*8–20.

*(xii) *v.6*, יָלַד, 'beget,' (10.viii).

(xiii) *v.7*$^{a}$, 'at my coming from Padan,' *comp.* xxviii.7—also J(xxxiii.18).

(xiv) *v.7*$^{a}$, 'Rachel died by me in the land of Canaan in the way, when there was yet a space of land to go to Ephrath, and I buried her there in the way of Ephrath,' as in xxxv.16$^{a}$,19$^{a}$.

(xv) *v.7*$^{a}$, 'and there I buried her'; *comp.* 'and there I buried Leah,' xlix.31.

N.B. The note in *v.*7, 'that is Bethlehem,' cannot, of course, be part of the speech ascribed to Jacob. It is probably a mere editorial note of explanation, which we may ascribe to D, as living in a later age than J, when, perhaps, such explanatory notices were more needed.

331. Jacob here mentions to Joseph, her eldest son, that he himself had buried *Rachel* near Ephrath, just as (according to the same writer) he tells his sons generally that he himself had buried *Leah* in the grave at Machpelah, xlix.31. The latter notice, which seems to be certainly due to E, appears to confirm also this before us as his property. And it should be observed that in xxxv.19$^{a}$ we read 'Rachel *was buried*,' *comp.* 'Abraham *was buried* and Sarah his wife,' xxv.10; but here we have 'there *I buried* Rachel,' *comp.* 'there *I buried* Leah,' xlix.31. This also implies that in the passage before us the original writer was modifying his own former expression, whereas a Compiler (to whom alone, if not to E, this notice must be ascribed) would more probably have copied literally the previous statement.

The old name of Bethel, *viz.* Luz, is mentioned in xxxv.6, but not in xxxv.9–15, and it might be supposed that the former belongs to E, and preceded originally *v.*9. But xxxv.6 contains the expression 'all the people that were with him,' *comp.* xxxii.7, xxxiii.15, which determines it for the Jehovist. And xlviii.3 does not require that 'Luz' should have been named before.

332. xlviii.8-22, *Jehovist.*

This passage appears to be introduced in order to explain the fact that Ephraim is set before Manasseh by E in *v.*5, in accordance with his tribal pre-eminence. J has made preparation for this by *v.*1,2, adapting his words very ingeniously to the E. passage *v.*3–7.

*(i) *v.*8,10,11,13,13,14,21, 'Israel,' as a personal name of Jacob,' (277.i).

(ii) *v.*8, 'the sons of Joseph,' referring to *v.*1, where *Manasseh* is, according to his age, put first.

(iii) *v.*8, 'who are these?' as in xxxiii.5, *comp.* xxxii.17, xxxiii.8.

(iv) *v.*9, 'the children which Elohim hath given to me,' (193.i);

*comp.* 'the children which Elohim hath granted to thy servant,' xxxiii.5.

*(v) *v.*9, בָּזֶה, 'in this,' (286.xxii).

(vi) *v.*10, 'and Israel's eyes were heavy through age; he was not able to see';

*comp.* 'Isaac was aged, and his eyes were dim so as not to see,' xxvii.1.

*(vii) *v.*10, כָּבֵד, 'be heavy,' (59.xiv).

*(viii) *v.*10,13, נָגַשׁ, 'come-near,' (97.xxxii).

(ix) *v.*10, 'and he kissed them and embraced them';

*comp.* 'and he embraced him and kissed him,' xxix.13, xxxiii.4.

(x) *v.*11, רְאוֹת for רְאֹת, comp. xxvi.28.

*(xi) *v.*11, 'see the face of,' (218.vi).

(xii) *v.*11, 'Elohim hath made me to see thy seed,' (193.i).

*(xiii) *v.*12, 'with his face to the earth,' (99.v,97.ix).

N.B. In *v.*12 the Jehovist makes Joseph bring-out his two sons from between his knees, thinking of them, apparently, as young children: whereas they were born before the famine, xli.50, and must therefore now have been at least seventeen or eighteen years of age, xlvii.28.

*(xiv) *v.*14, הַצָּעִיר, 'the younger,' הַבְּכוֹר, 'the firstborn,' (47.viii).

(xv) *v.*14, שֹׂכֶל, 'doing wisely,' *comp.* הַשְׂכִּיל, 'making wise,' iii.6.

(xvi) *v.*15, Joseph is here blessed singly as one tribe, as in xlix.22–24.

(xvii) *v.*15, 'ELOHIM before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac have walked ELOHIM who hath fed me from my being until this day,' (193.i).

(xviii) *v.*15, 'before whom my fathers have walked';

*comp.* 'before whom I walk,' xxiv.40:

E has the phrase, xvii.1, and also 'walk with Elohim,' v.22,24, vi.9.

(xix) *v.*15, 'Elohim who hath *fed* me';

*comp.* 'from whence is the *feeder*,' xlix.24.

*(xx) *v.*15, 'unto this day,' (99.lviii).

(xxi) *v.*16, 'the Angel who hath redeemed me from all evil,' refers to the special promises of protection for Jacob in all places, xxviii.15, *comp.* 'He, *before whom I walk*, shall send *His angel* before thee,' xxiv.7,40.

(xxii) *v.*16, 'by them shall my name be called,' *i.e.* when men wish to speak of

the greatness of *Israel*, they will do it by speaking of that of *Ephraim*, as a similar formula, 'by thee shall Israel bless,' is explained in *v.*20, (186.xiv).

(xxiii) *v.*16, 'and they shall swarm-as-fish for multitude in the midst of the land,' *v.*19, 'and his seed shall be the fulness of the nations,' (63.xxv).

(xxiv) *v.*16, 'in the midst (קֶרֶב) of the land,' as in xlv.6.

(xxv) *v.*17, 'be evil in his eyes,' as in xxxviii.10.

*(xxvi) *v.*17, סוּר, 'turn-aside,' (43.v).

*(xxvii) *v.*19, 'and he refused,' (281.xii).

(xxviii) *v.*19, 'he shall grow,' xxv.27, xxvi.13.

(xxix) *v.*19, וְאוּלָם, 'and nevertheless,' as in xxviii.19.

*(xxx) *v.*19, 'younger brother,' (47.viii).

*(xxxi) *v.*19, גָּדַל מִן, 'be greater than,' (5.xviii).

(xxxii) *v.*20, 'in that day,' (99.lvi).

(xxxiii) *v.*20, 'Elohim place thee as Ephraim and as Manasseh,' (193.i).

(xxxiv) *v.*21, 'behold, I die!' as in l.5, *comp.* xxx.1ᵇ, l.24.

(xxxv) *v.*21, 'Elohim will be with (עִם) you,' (193.i).

(xxxvi) *v.*21, 'Elohim will be with you, and bring-you-back into the land of your fathers';

*comp.* 'I am with thee and will bring-thee-back unto this ground,' xxviii.15; 'I will go down with thee into Egypt, and will also surely bring-thee-up,' xlvi.4.

(xxxvii) *v.*21, 'land of your fathers,' *comp.* 'land of thy fathers,' xxxi.3.

(xxxviii) *v.*22, 'one shoulder (שְׁכֶם) more than thy brethren,' a play upon the name *Shechem* (3.iv).

*(xxxix) *v.*22, take out of the hand of,' (5.xv).

333. Jacob here gives to Joseph in *v.*22 a portion of land, which he had—

'taken out of the hand of the *Amorite* by his sword and his bow';

whereas Joseph's bones were buried at Shechem, Jo.xxiv.32—

'in the parcel of ground which Jacob bought of Hamor the father of Shechem for a hundred of silver,'—

as related in G.xxxiii.19. Yet here Jacob speaks of some conquest which he had made by *force*, as seems implied by the proverbial expression which he uses, *comp.* Jo.xxiv.12, Ps.xliv.6. It seems to us that the writer really does refer to the violent conquest and sacking of Shechem, which he himself has described in xxxiv, although he makes Jacob censure it both in xxxiv.30 and in xlix.5–7. 'Amorite' would then be used here in a general sense, as including 'Hivite,' xxxiv.2, *comp.* 1S.vii.14, 2S.xxi.2,&c. There is nothing more incongruous in this, than

in his making Jacob give the land to Joseph at all, if he had at any time made a conquest of it,—Jacob being now a poor dependent in Egypt and the land in question in Canaan. This author, as we have seen in several instances, is very careless as to the different parts of his narrative corresponding completely with each other.

BOEHMER agrees with this view, though assigning *v.*22 to the later Editor; and so he writes, *p.*284—

'The Compiler makes Jacob here take upon himself the responsibility of the conquest of Shechem, which through his manipulation of xxxiv [supposed by BOEHMER, but not allowed by our analysis] was represented as an act of just revenge; and he will only allow the unnecessary cruelty which accompanied it to be cursed by the dying father.'

334. HUPFELD gives to E *v.*3–6, *p.*84, and to $E_2$ *v.*8–22, *p.*48: he says nothing about *v.*7, which we give also to E, or about *v.*1,2, which he would probably give, as we do, to J, to whom he has assigned the preceding context, xlvii.29–31.

ILGEN, *p.*432, gives *v.*3–7 to E, and *v.*1,2,8–22, to $E_2$.

EWALD gives also *v.*3–7,22, to his 'Book of Origins,' corresponding nearly to our Elohist.

BOEHMER gives *v.*1,2,$9^b$,$10^a$,13,14,17–19, to J,—*v.*8,$9^a$,$10^b$,11, $12^b$,20, to $E_2$,—*v.*3–7,$12^a$,15,16,21,22, to the Compiler.

It is obvious that BOEHMER'S division is here again very artificial, and can only be allowed upon very convincing evidence. But the fact is that his 'Compiler' is frequently very useful in taking charge of passages, which give strong indications of one of the *other two* sources, because *he* may be supposed to have been familiar with, and therefore to have imitated, the style of *either* of them. Thus with respect to *v.*3–6, which ILGEN, HUPFELD, and EWALD, agree with us in giving to E, BOEHMER writes, *p.*287:

'We cannot possibly think of E for these verses, since he has nowhere named the sons of Jacob, not even Joseph, much less his grandsons—[yes, he has in xlvi.8–27, and expressly Manasseh and Ephraim, *v.*20]—and thus *v.*3,4, which most strongly remind us of him, would have no hold in his narrative. We must therefore have recourse to the Compiler's *reminiscences of the Elohistic formulæ*.

To a certain moderate extent such reminiscences might be recognised as possible and probable, in any author writing to supplement another. But the resemblances are here much too strong to be explained in this way, as also are the *differences* (330.ii,331).

335. We may notice the following remarks of BOEHMER.

(i) The writer in *v.*8 and *v.*11, who speaks of Jacob *seeing* Joseph's sons, must be different from him who writes in *v.*10ᵃ, that Jacob's eyes were 'dim, so that he could not see.' *p.*278.

*Ans.* In *v.*8 he *sees* them—that is, he sees that *two lads* are there—but does not *recognise* them, because of his dimness, *v.*10ᵃ; so they are brought near to him *v.*10ᵇ, and he sees Joseph's seed, *v.*11.

(ii) *v.*12ᵇ, 'and he bowed himself *before his face* (לְאַפָּיו = לְפָנָיו, not אַפַּיִם as in xix.1, xlii.6ᵇ,) to the earth,' must refer to *Jacob* as subject, *v.*11; and there is probably a partial fulfilment intended here of Joseph's dreams in xxxvii.5–11, since Jacob, though really bowing to God, was bowing before—*i.e.* in the presence of—Joseph. *p.*279,280.

*Ans.* No doubt, the phrase should be translated 'before his face,' *comp.*1S.xxv.23, 'and she fell *before the face* (לְאַפֵּי) of David *on her face*.' But the subject is *Joseph* in *v.*12ᵃ, who, after bringing-out his sons between his knees, prostrates himself before his aged father, and then rises and leads his sons up to him, *v.*13: unless we accept the correction of the Sept., Sam., and Syr. '*they* (Ephraim and Manasseh) bowed.' It seems also very far-fetched to suppose in an act of adoration on the part of Jacob, performed in the presence of Joseph, any fulfilment of the prediction of the dream that he should bow *to* Joseph. Nothing is said about Joseph's *mother* bowing *to* or *before* him, and in fact both Leah and Rachel had died, according to E, in Canaan, xxxv.19, xlix.31; yet *she* was included also in the *dream*, xxxvii.9,10.

(iii) The conclusion of xlvii cannot be from the same hand as xlviii.1,2; because in xlvii.29 Jacob is near his death, and summons Joseph to give his last commands to him; whereas in xlviii.1,2, Joseph is informed that his father is sick, and takes his sons with him in order that their grandfather might bless them, which, on account of his being then 'about to die,' we should rather have expected at the *former* visit, if one and the same writer had related all this.' *p.*286.

*Ans.* There is no incongruity here: the statement in xlvii.29, that 'the days of Israel *drew-near* for dying,' does not mean that his death was *close at hand*, but only that he felt increasing weakness, and, in anticipation of his death, enjoined Joseph about his burial. It is not said that Joseph took the boys in order that they might be blessed; but Jacob, when he saw them, said 'Bring-them-near unto me, and I will bless them.' But such a blessing, at the hour of death, would doubtless have been regarded as most solemn, and full of the spirit of prophecy; *comp.* Jacob's Blessing on his sons, xlix.1–27, and the Blessing of Moses, D.xxxiii.

336. xlix.1[a], *Elohist.*

These words, 'and Jacob called unto his sons,' appear to stand in connection with *v.*28[b]–33, 'and he blessed them . . . and charged them, and said unto them &c.' We have here in *v.*1[a] 'Jacob,' as in *v.*33, not 'Israel,' as in xlviii.8,11,13,13,14,21; and we have also the same form קָרָא אֶל, 'called unto,' as is used by E in xxviii.1; though these indications by themselves would not suffice to *fix* the clause on E; since both these expressions are also used by J. But the comparison with xxviii.1 seems to be decisive: viz.—

'and Jacob called unto his sons, and blessed them, . . . and charged them, and said unto them';

*comp.* 'and Isaac called unto Jacob, and blessed him, and charged him, and said to him,' xxviii.1.

BOEHMER, who makes xlix.29 follow xlvii.28 in E, does not explain how he gets over the obvious hiatus between these verses, *viz.*—

'And Jacob lived 17 years in the land of Canaan, and his whole age was 147 years. . . . And he commanded *them* and spake to *them*, &c.'

And a similar difficulty will exist on HUPFELD'S view, which makes xlix.29 follow xlviii.6.

The fact is that *v.*1[a] cannot be dispensed with for the J. passage xlix.1–28, *if* the Jehovist was an *independent* writer; though it might, of course, be supposed that the same or a like phrase existed *both* in E and J, and that one of these was struck out by the Compiler. But, on our view, J has merely inserted the 'Blessing' between *v.*1[a] and *v.*29 of the Elohist.

337. xlix.1[b]–28[a], *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*2, קִבָּץ, 'collect,' as in xli.35,48.

*(ii) *v.*2, 'Israel,' as a personal name for Jacob (277.i).

(iii) *v.*3, אוֹן, 'labour,' as in xxxv.18.

*(iv) *v.*3,3, יֶתֶר, 'excellency,' *v.*4, הוֹתִיר, 'excel,' (216.xix).

(v) *v.*4, 'thou ascendedst thy father's bed,' refers to xxxv.22.

(vi) *v.*5–7, refers to the treacherous and cruel sack of the town of Shechem, in which Simeon and Levi took the most prominent part, xxxiv.25–31.

(vii) *v.6*, 'my soul,' (*59.xxi*).

*(viii) *v.6*, כָּבוֹד, 'glory,' (*59.xiv*).

(ix) *v.6*, רָצוֹן, 'pleasure,' *comp.* רָצָה, 'be pleased,' xxxiii.10.

*(x) *v.7*, 'cursed be their anger,' *comp.* the curses in (4.xiv).

(xi) *v.7*, קָשָׁה, 'hard,' (*259.i*).

(xii) *v.7,27*, חָלַק, 'divide,' *comp.* חֵלֶק, 'share'—also $J_2$(xiv.15,24,24).

*(xiii) *v.7*, פּוּץ, 'be spread-abroad,' (*50.viii*).

(xiv) *v.8*, 'Judah (יְהוּדָה) thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise (יוֹדוּךָ),' a play upon the name 'Judah,' (3.iv).

(xv) *v.8*, 'thy father's sons shall bow-down to thee';

*comp.* 'thy mother's sons shall bow-down to thee,' xxvii.29.

*(xvi) *v.9*, טֶרֶף, 'prey,' *v.27*, טָרַף, 'tear-in-pieces,' (*220.xlvi*).

*(xvii) *v.9,14,25*, רֶבֶץ, 'couch,' (*5.ix*).

*(xviii) *v.10*, סוּר, 'turn-aside,' (*43.v*).

*(xix) *v.10*, עַד־כִּי, 'until,' as in xxvi.13, xli.49—only besides in 2S.xxiii.10.

*(xx) *v.11*, אָסַר, 'bind,' (*287.xxxvii*).

*(xxi) *v.13*, שָׁכַן, 'abide,' (*4.xxvii*).

(xxii) *v.13*, there seems an allusion in the expression 'Zebulun shall *abide*' to the J. derivation of the name in xxx.20$^b$ from זָבַל, 'dwell,' which being an unusual word—used nowhere else in the Bible—may have been replaced here by שָׁכַן, (3.iv).

*(xxiii) *v.15*, נָטָה, 'extend,' (*59.x*).

(xxiv) *v.15*, there is probably also a play on the name 'Issachar,' from שָׂכָר, 'hire,' properly *Issaschar* (יִשָּׂשכָר = יִשָּׂא שָׂכָר, 'he will bear off a hire,') in the notice of his being an 'ass couching between the folds,' and becoming a 'servant for tribute,' (3.iv).

N.B. The *order* of Zebulun and Issachar is different here from that of their birth, xxx.18,20, and from the order observed in all the other notices, xxxv.23, xlvi.13,14, E.i.3, N.i.8,9,28,30,ii.5,7, vii.18,24, xxvi.23,26: the variation is probably accidental.

(xxv) *v.16*, 'Dan shall judge (יָדִין) his people'—a play on the name 'Dan,' (3.iv).

N.B. Here in *v.16,28*, the Bible first mentions the 'tribes of Israel.'

(xxvi) *v.17*, אֹרַח, 'path,' as in xviii.11.

(xxvii) *v.19*, 'Gad, a troop (גְּדוּד) shall overcome him (יְגוּדֶנּוּ), but he shall overcome (יָגֻד),' a play on the name 'Gad,' (3.iv).

(xxviii) *v.21*, there is probably a far-fetched allusion to the name Naphtali, in the use of אַיָּלָה, as if נַפְתִּלִי = נַפַּת־אַיָּלָה, 'hill of the hind,' *comp.* נַפַּת־דּוֹר, Jo.xii.23, or נַפַּת־אֵילָה, 'hill of the terebinth,' if we adopt with EWALD the reading of BOCHART, who in the next line also points אַמְרֵי, 'boughs,' for אִמְרֵי, 'words.'

(xxix) *v.22–26*, Joseph is here blessed as one tribe, but apparently with a special reference to Ephraim in *v.22*,—see (xxx) below,—as in xlviii.15–20.

(xxx) *v.22,22*, there is, perhaps, a play on the name 'Ephraim' in the repeated use of פֹּרָת, 'fruitful,' *comp.* the derivation of 'Ephraim' in xli.52, (3.iv).

(xxxi *v.*23, שָׂטַם, 'hate,' as in xxvii.41, l.15.

(xxxii) *v.*23, 'lords of arrows,' *comp.* 'lord of dreams,' xxxvii.19—$J_3$(xiv.13).

(xxxiii) *v.*24, רָעָה. 'feed,' used of the Deity, as in xlviii.15.

(xxxiv) *v.*25, 'the El of thy father,' (193.ii).

(xxxv) *v.*24,25, 'Mighty-One of Jacob,' '*Feeder*' = Shepherd, 'Stone of Israel,' 'the El of thy father,' 'El Shaddai;'

*comp.* the similar heaping together of epithets in xlviii.15,16, 'the ELOHIM before whom my fathers walked,' 'ELOHIM who *fed* me,' 'the Angel who redeemed me.'

(xxxvi) *v.*25, 'El Shaddai,' (the true reading, *Sam. Text, Sam. Vers., Syr.*) as in xliii.14.

(xxxvii) *v.*25, 'blessings of heaven from above, blessings of the deep that coucheth beneath, blessings of the breasts and womb';

*comp.* 'ELOHIM give thee of the dew of heaven, and of the fatness of the earth,' xxvii.28;

'Thy dwelling shall be of the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above,' xxvii.39.

(xxxviii) *v.*26, 'everlasting mountains,' *comp.* 'everlasting El,' xxi.33.

N.B. Both HUPFELD and BOEHMER give the above passage to the Jehovist, except that the latter assigns *v.*18 to the Compiler, on account of its standing so singularly alone.

It thus appears, as HUPFELD says, *p.*74, 'that all the poetical passages in Genesis,—*i. e. prophecies* of this kind, whether blessings or curses,—are without exception from the Jehovist, to whose historical style it belongs to introduce such passages as these into the narrative.'

### 338. xlix.28$^b$-33, *Elohist.*

It seems plain, from the comparison with xxviii.1 (336), that *v.*28$^b$ is due to E, and stood originally in connection with *v.*1$^a$. The Elohist has merely said that Jacob blessed his sons, 'each according to his blessing he blessed them': the Jehovist has filled up these blessings, though that pronounced on Simeon and Levi sounds more like a *curse*. Hence BOEHMER has given *v.*28$^b$ to the *Compiler*, *p.*291, (and not to the Jehovist, as HUPFELD,) supposing him to have intended to say that either after the words addressed to each, or after the delivery of the whole 'Blessing,' Jacob blessed each of his sons separately, laying his hand, perhaps, upon the head of each, with a few words of blessing—which is exactly what *we* suppose may have been intended by E.

(i) *v.*28$^b$, 'his blessing,' *comp.* 'Abraham's blessing,' xxviii.4.

(ii) *v.*29, אֲנִי, 'I' (19.ix).

*(iii) *v.*29, 'I shall be gathered unto my people,' *v.*33, 'and he expired and was gathered unto his people,' (147.iv).

*(iv) *v.*29,30,32, the cave of Machpelah accurately described, (139.viii).

*(v) *v.*30, 'which Abraham bought with the field from Ephron the Hittite,' as in xxiii.

*(vi) *v.*30, אֲחֻזָּה, 'possession,' (95.xxiii).

(vii) *v.*31, 'there they buried Abraham, xxv.9, and Sarah his wife,' xxiii.19;
*comp.* 'there was buried Abraham and Sarah his wife,' xxv.10.

(viii) *v.*31, 'there they buried Isaac,' xxxv.29.

(ix) *v.*31,31, 'they buried,' the plur. impers. form, as in xxv.25.

(x) *v.*31, 'there I buried Rachel'; *comp.* 'Abraham buried Sarah,' xxiii.19.

(xi) *v.*33, 'and Jacob ended to charge his sons';
*comp.* 'and He ended to speak with him,' xvii.22:
J has the same phrase in xxiv.19.

(xii) *v.*33, הַמִּטָּה, 'the bed,' may have been imitated by J in xlvii.31, xlviii.2.

*(xiii) *v.*33, גָּוַע, 'expire,' (19.xi).

HUPFELD assigns *v.*29–33 to E. BOEHMER gives *v.*29,30,32, to E, but *v.*31,33, to the Compiler—*v.*31[a], because E has not as yet mentioned anywhere the burial of Rebekah and Leah,—*v.*31[b], because the conclusion would be tame, if the notice stopped with *v.*31[a],—*v.*33, because it refers to the 'bed' in xlviii.2, whereas we suppose rather the latter to have been taken from the passage before us.

339. l.1–12, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*1, Joseph, no doubt, is supposed to have closed his father's eyes, according to the promise in xlvi.4.

*(ii) *v.*1, 'and Joseph fell upon his father's face and wept upon him and kissed him,' (304.xxvii).

*(iii) *v.*1, Joseph's 'weeping,' (298.xxx).

*(iv) *v.*1, 'he kissed him,' (180.xxv).

*(v) *v.*2, 'Israel,' as a personal name of Jacob, (277.i).

(vi) *v.*2,3, 'embalm,' and *v.*3, the 'forty days' of embalming, show some knowledge of Egyptian practices, as in xlvii.20–22,26.

N.B. The 'seventy' days in *v.*3 probably included the 'forty' days of embalming and a month = 'thirty' days of weeping, see N.xx.29, D.xxxiv.8, *comp.* D.xxi.13. Diodorus says that they took more than 30 days, and he assigns 72 days as the time for a *royal* mourning; Herodotus gives 70 days for the embalming; perhaps, as BOEHMER observes, *p.*295, the main part of the business was over in the first part of this time.

(vii) *v.*3, 'forty days were fulfilled,' 'the days are fulfilled';

*comp.* 'my days are fulfilled,' xxix.21,—also E(xxv.24).

(viii) *v.*3,4, בָּכָה, 'weep,' (180 xli).

*(ix) *v.*4, 'if, I pray, I have found favour in your eyes,' (97.xi,13.xii).

(x) *v.*4, 'speak, I pray, in the ears of Pharaoh';

*comp.* 'let thy servant speak, I pray, a word in the ears of my lord,' xliv.18.

N.B. Joseph, being in mourning, could not himself in person approach the king at this time, *comp.* Esth.iv.2.

(xi) *v.*5, 'my father made me swear,' *v.*6, 'as he made thee swear,' refers to xlvii.29,30.

(xii) *v.*5, 'behold I die!' as in xlviii.21, *comp.* xxx.1$^b$, l.24.

(xiii) *v.*5, 'in my burying-place,' *comp.* 'in their burying-place,' xlvii.30.

(xiv) *v.*5, כָּרָה, 'hew out,' as in xxvi.25.

N.B. It may be supposed that Jacob had had a place prepared for himself in the cave of Machpelah, at the time when he buried Leah, xlix.31: in D.ii.6, 2K.vi.23, Hos.iii.2, the word כָּרָה is used in the sense of 'procure, obtain'; but that can scarcely apply here, since *Abraham* bought this place, xxiii.16. Probably E (as BOEHMER says, *p.*296) thought of the patriarchs only as buried underground in the cave of Machpelah.

(xv) *v.*7, 'Pharaoh's servants, elders of his house';

*comp.* 'his servant, elder of his house,' xxiv.2.

*(xvi) *v.*8, טַף, 'little-ones,' (241.xxxvi).

(xvii) *v.*8, 'flocks and herds,' (59.xxii).

*(xviii) *v.*8, עָזַב, 'leave,' (3.xviii).

*(xix) *v.*8, 'Goshen,' (304.xviii).

*(xx) *v.*9, מַחֲנֶה, 'camp,' (231.vii).

*(xxi) *v.*9,10,11, 'very heavy,' as in xiii.2, xviii.20, xli.31, xlvii.13.

*(xxii) *v.*9,10,11, כָּבֵד, 'heavy,' (59.xiv).

*(xxiii) *v.*11, 'the dweller in the land,' (63.xi).

*(xxiv) *v.*11, 'the dweller in the land, the Canaanite,' (63.x).

*(xxv) *v.*11, 'therefore (עַל־כֵּן) one called its name Abel-Mizraim,' derivation of the name 'Abel-Mizraim' = mourning to the Egyptians, (55.xii).

N.B. 'Abel-Mizraim' means properly 'meadow of Egypt,' *comp.* Abel-Keramim, Ju.xi.33, Abel-Meholah, Ju.vii.22, 1K.iv.12, xix.16, Abel-Maim, 2Ch.xvi.4. But the Jehovist has read אֵבֶל, 'mourning,' for אָבֵל, 'meadow,' and so connects the place with this story. In point of fact, as BOEHMER notes, *p.*249, it was out of the question for the cavalcade to have actually gone around by this place, which Jerome describes as opposite Jericho, and to reach which they must have gone along the east shore of the Dead Sea, through the country of the Moabites and Ammonites, and then, crossing the Jordan, have gone south again to Hebron, and must have taken the same circuitous route on their return to Egypt—instead of going by the regular caravan-track straight to Beersheba, and so to Hebron and back again.

(xxvi) *v.*12, 'do to,' a person, ix.24, xii.18, xvi.6, xix.8,8,19, xxi.6, xxii.12, xxvi.10,29, xxvii.37,45, xxix.25, xxx.31, xxxi.12,xlii.25,28, l.12—also E$_2$(xx.9,9,13), xxi.23,—nowhere used by E.

(xxvii) *v.*12, 'and his sons did to him so as he had charged them';

*comp.* 'and Jehovah did to Sarah as He had spoken,' xxi.1—where we have just the same J. connecting link as here.

N.B. HUPFELD, *p.*48, assigns with us *v.*1–11 to the Jehovist. BOEHMER gives the same to the Compiler, *p.*295–298,—as, indeed, he was obliged to do, having already given to him xlvii.29,30, to which reference is made very plainly in this section.

Both HUPFELD and BOEHMER give *v.*12 to E: but it clearly belongs to J for the reasons stated above (xxvi,xxvii).

340. In *v.*10,11, we have 'on the other side (בְּעֵבֶר) of the Jordan,' as in D.i.1,5, iii.8,20,25, iv.41,46,47, xi.30, Jo.i.15, ii. 10, v.1, vii.7, ix.1,10, xii.1,7, xiii.8, xxii.4, xxiv.2,8,14,15, Ju. v.17, x.8, 1S.xxxi.7, *comp.* Jo.xxiv.2,14,15, Ju.xi.18, 1S.xxxi.7, Jer.xxv.22. These are the only passages in which בְּעֵבֶר occurs in the Bible, and they are almost all Deuteronomistic; whereas in the rest of the Pentateuch we find only מֵעֵבֶר used in the above phrase, N.xxi.13,xxii.1, xxxii.19,19,32, xxxiv.15, xxxv.14, also D.xxx.13. It would seem to follow from this that either the verses before us are a Deut. interpolation—which does not seem probable, when we consider (xxiii,xxiv,xxv) in the above analysis,—or that the Jehovist had probably no hand in writing the passages of Numbers above-quoted.

341. l.13, *Elohist.*

(i) *v.*13, 'and his sons carried him, &c.,' appears to follow properly after xlix.33: the repetition of 'and his sons,' in *v.*12,13, confirms our view that *v.*12 belongs to the Jehovist.

*(ii) *v.*13, the cave of Machpelah described (139.viii).

*(iii) *v.*13, 'which Abraham bought with the field from Ephron the Hittite,' as in xlix.30.

Both HUPFELD and BOEHMER agree with us as to the above.

342. l.14–26, *Jehovist.*

(i) *v.*14, 'and Joseph returned to Egypt,' according to his words in *v.*5.

(ii) *v.*14, 'he and his brethren and all that went-up with him to bring his father,' refers to *v.*7,9.

(iii) *v.*14, 'he and his brethren, and all that went-up with him,' (22.i).

(iv) *v.*15, לְנוּ, 'perhaps,' as in xxx.34—also E(xxiii.5,13,14).

(v) *v.*15, יִשְׂטְמֵם, 'hate,' xxvii.41, xlix.23.

(vi) *v.*15, 'and will surely requite to us all the evil which we did to him,' *v.*17, 'they have done evil to thee,' *v.*20, 'ye meant evil against me,' refer to the story of their conduct to Joseph in xxxvii.18–27.

*(vii) *v.*17,17, נָשָׂא, 'forgive,' (5.xix).

(viii) *v.*17, 'the Elohim of thy father,' (193.ii).

*(ix) *v.*17, Joseph's 'weeping,' (298.xxx).

(x) *v.*18, 'and they fell before him and said, Behold us to thee for servants!'

*comp.* 'and they fell before him . . . and Judah said, . . . Behold us servants to my lord!' xliv.14,16.

*(xi) *v.*18, 'behold us to thee for servants,' (302.xvi).

(xii) *v.*19,21, 'fear not,' (171.xiv).

(xiii) *v.*19, 'am I in the place of Elohim?' as in xxx.2 (193.i).

(xiv) *v.*20, 'Elohim meant it for good,' (193.i).

(xv) *v.*20,20, חָשַׁב, 'mean,' as in xxxi.15, xxxviii.15.

(xvi) *v.*20, לְמַעַן, 'in order that,' (59.xviii).

(xvii) *v.*20, עֲשֹׂה, 'doing,' without an object, as in xxxi.28.

(xviii) *v.*20, כַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה, 'as at this day,' *comp.* xxv.31,33.

(xix) *v.*20, 'to save-alive much people,' (304.x).

(xx) *v.*21, 'I will nourish you and your little-ones';

*comp.* 'and Joseph nourished his father, &c.,' xlvii.12.

(xxi) *v.*21, כִּלְכֵּל, 'nourish,' (304.xxiii).

*(xxii) *v.*21, טַף, 'little-ones,' (241.xxxvi).

*(xxiii) *v.*21, נִחַם, 'comfort,' (11.ii).

(xxiv) *v.*21, 'speak upon the heart,' as in xxxiv.3.

N.B. *v.*21 implies that the famine *still continued*, though Jacob had lived seventeen years in Egypt, xlvii.28, and had therefore outlived the famine 12 years, xlv.6. As they had 'flocks and herds,' xlvi.32, there was no need for Joseph to have nourished them except for the famine. Clearly the Jehovist has committed here one of his very common acts of inadvertence.

(xxv) *v.*22, 'and Joseph dwelt in Egypt,' *comp.* xxvi.6, 'and Isaac dwelt in Gerar.'

(xxvi) *v.*22, 'he and his father's house,' (22.i).

(xxvii) *v.*22, 'and Joseph lived 110 years,' *v.*26, 'and Joseph died a son of 110 years,' *comp.* the J. time-data in xli.46, xlv.6, and observe that E never uses the phrase 'and he lived, &c.,' to express merely the duration of the *whole* life. If E had written this verse, we should expect 'and Joseph lived *after* his going-down to Egypt, &c., and the days of the years of his life were, &c.' In fact, E gives the statement of Joseph's death in E.i.6, without any date.

(xxviii) *v.*22, מֵאָה, 'hundred,' (13.v).

(xxix) *v.*23, 'were born upon the knees of Joseph':

*comp.* 'she shall bear upon my knees,' xxx.3.

N.B. Ephraim is here put first, as in xlviii.20.

(xxx) *v.*24, 'I die,' as in xxx.1ᵇ, *comp.* xlviii.21, l.5.

(xxxi) *v.*24,25, 'Elohim shall surely visit you,' (193.i).

(xxxii) *v.*24,24,25,25, פָּקַד, 'visit,' as in xxi.1.

(xxxiii) *v.*24, 'and bring-you-up out of the land';

*comp.* 'and I will also surely bring-thee-up again,' xlvi.4.

(xxxiv) *v.*24, 'the land which he sware to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, (141.xv. N.B.);

*comp.* 'who sware unto me, saying, To thy seed will I give this land,' xxiv.7;

'to thee and to thy seed will I give these lands, and I will establish the oath which I sware to Abraham thy father,' xxvi.3.

(xxxv) *v.*25, 'and Joseph made the sons of Israel swear,' *comp.* *v.*5,6, xxiv.3,37.

(xxxvi) *v.*25, מִזֶּה, 'from this,' (277.xix).

(xxxvii) *v.*26, 'embalm,' as in *v.*2,3.

(xxxviii) *v.*26, וַיִּישָׂם, 'and he was placed,' as in xxiv.33,—*nowhere else in the Bible.*

HUPFELD, *p.*48, is disposed to assign *v.*15–26 to $E_2$, 'because of the often-recurring name Elohim'—'although much also,' he says, 'especially *v.*23,&c., seems to point to the Jehovist, to whom *v.*1–11,14,26, must belong,'—but he gives *v.*22 to E, *p.*85.

BOEHMER, *p.*90,119,299,300, gives *v.*22[a] to $E_2$, *v.*15–21,22[b], 23, to J, *v.*14,24–26, to the Compiler.

## 343. E.i.1–6, *Elohist.*

(i) *v.*1, 'and these are the names of the sons of Israel who came into Egypt, as in G.xlvi.8;

*comp.* the repetition of the 'sons of Noah,' G.v.32, vi.10.

N.B. It seems very natural that this list should be repeated here, at the beginning of another phase in the history of Israel.

*(ii) *v.*1, 'and these are the names, &c.,' (152.iv).

(iii) *v.*5, נֶפֶשׁ, 'soul'=person, (60.vii).

*(iv) *v.*5, 'all the souls that went-out of the thigh of Jacob,' (315.ix).

(v) *v.*5, 'seventy souls,' as in G.xlvi.27.

(vi) *v.*6, 'and Joseph died,' anticipated by the Jehovistic statement in I.26.

*(vii) *v.*7, פָּרָה וְרָבָה, 'fructify and multiply,' (1.iv).

*(viii) *v.*7, שָׁרַץ, 'swarm,' (1.ii).

*(ix) *v.*7, בִּמְאֹד מְאֹד, 'exceedingly,' (95.x).

(x) *v.*7, 'and the earth (=land) was filled with them';

*comp.* 'and the earth was filled with violence,' G.vi.11;

'and fill the earth,' G.i.28, ix.1.

N.B. Apparently, the expression 'sons of Israel' in *v.*1 is used in the general sense of 'children of Israel,' as in G.xlvi.8; for E never employs 'Israel' as a personal name of Jacob.

344. E.ii.23$^{b}$–25, *Elohist.*

In *v.*23$^{b}$ we read of the children of Israe 'groaning' under their heavy 'service,' and of course something must have been said by E between i.7 and ii.23$^{b}$, explaining in what this service consisted. It is not my present purpose to examine whether any fragments of this narrative may be recovered, but merely to show that the Elohist's hand can be traced distinctly to the important passage E.vi.2–7, where he first uses the name Jehovah. As to *v.*23$^{a}$, it contains the J. expression 'many days,' (128.iv); and the whole clause—

'and it came to pass in those many days that the king of Egypt died,'—

appears to be due to the writer of the preceding section, preparing for the return of Moses to Egypt: *comp.* ii.15 with iv.19, in which last we have the name 'Jehovah.'

(i) *v.*23$^{b}$,23$^{b}$, 'service,' as in E.vi.6,9.

(ii) *v.*24, 'Elohim heard their groaning';

*comp.* 'I have heard the groaning of the children of Israel,' E.vi.5.

*(iii) *v.*24, 'and Elohim remembered His covenant,' (37.i)

*(iv) *v.*24, 'His covenant,' (19.xiii).

(v) *v.*24, 'His covenant with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob,' refers to the promise to give to them and to their seed after them the land of Canaan, G.xvii.8, xxxv.12.

345. E.vi.2–7, *Elohist.*

(i) *v.*2, 'and He said unto him, I am Jehovah';

*comp.* 'and He said unto him, I am El Shaddai,' G.xvii.1.

(ii) *v.*2,5,7, אֲנִי, 'I,' (19.ix).

(iii) *v.*3, 'and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by El Shaddai,' refers to G.xvii.1 (Abraham) and xxxv.11 (Jacob): but there is no record of any separate appearance to Isaac; it would seem that the appearance to Abraham was supposed to include one to Isaac, (95.xxi. N.B.).

(iv) *v.*3, 'and I appeared by El-Shaddai,' as in G.xvii.1,xxxv.11.

(v) *v.*4,5, וְגַם, 'and also,' as in G.xvii.16,—the only instances hitherto where E has used the particle גַּם.

*(vi) *v.*4, 'establish a covenant,' (19.xii).

*(vii) *v.*4,5, 'my covenant,' (19.xiii).

*(viii) *v.*4, 'to give to them the land of Canaan, the land of their sojournings, in which they sojourned,' (95.xxi).

*(ix) *v.*4, 'land of their sojournings,' (95.xxii).

(x) *v.*5, 'I have heard the groaning of the children of Israel';
*comp.* 'Elohim heard their groaning,' ii.24.
*(xi) *v.*5, 'I have remembered my covenant,' (37.i).
(xii) *v.*6, 'service,' as in ii.23$^{b}$,23$^{b}$.
(xiii) *v.*7, 'and I will be to them for Elohim,' (95.xx).
J has also 'then shall Jehovah be to me for Elohim,' G.xxviii.21.

N.B. In *v.*8, we have 'and I will bring you into the land, as to which I (lifted-up my hand=) sware to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob,' with which *comp.* G.l.24, and the passages quoted in (342.xxxiv), from which it would seem that this verse is an addition by the Jehovist, who alone has spoken about an 'oath' and 'swearing' in Genesis: and accordingly we find here also מוֹרָשָׁה, 'inheritance,' instead of the Elohistic אֲחֻזָּה.

346. Thus we have shown that the same Elohistic author, whom we have recognised distinctly as the writer of a large part of Genesis, and as laying the foundation of the whole Pentateuchal narrative, is certainly the writer also of E.vi.2-7. Up to this point, then, he has abstained all along from using the name 'Jehovah.' But now in *v.*6,7, that Name is announced to Israel as the Name henceforth of their covenant-God,—

'Say unto the children of Israel, I am Jehovah. . . . and ye shall know that I am Jehovah your God, who bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians.'

347. It is plain from this that he has *designedly* suppressed it till now, and that the words in *v.*3,—

'I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by El Shaddai, but by my name Jehovah *was I not known* to them,'—

were really meant to say that the latter Name *was not even known*—not merely *was not fully declared*—to the three Patriarchs, or to any before the time of this revelation to Moses.

348. From this it follows that there is direct contradiction between this account of the Elohist and that of the Jehovist, who represents the name 'Jehovah' as well-known to the Patriarchs, G.xxiv.3, xxvii.27, xxviii.21, and even to heathen persons, xxvi.28,29, long before the time of Moses,—as well as with that of the Deuteronomist, who actually derives the name of a place, 'Jehovah-Jireh,' in the days of Abraham from it, G.xxii.14,

349. But the fact in question does much more than this. It shows that there is no foundation for the notion, which some have suggested in order to get over this difficulty, *viz.* that, in describing the antediluvian and postdiluvian times *before his own*, Moses may—or rather must—have made use of *ancient* documents, which he may have inserted in his narrative, and *these* may in some points be found to conflict with each other; whereas in describing those matters in which he himself took a prominent part—*viz.* those connected with the Exodus —he would, of course, write with full *personal* knowledge, and would record with strict—or, as many think, even verbal—accuracy.

350. For here we find that E.vi.2–7, describing the primary direct communication from Jehovah to Moses,—which must surely have been written by him, if any part of the Pentateuch is his—is the work of the very same author, who wrote the First Chapter of Genesis, the *first* accounts of the Creation and the Deluge, the Divine appearances to Abraham and Jacob, &c. —in a word, all the *oldest*, or Elohistic, portions of Genesis, and who thus laid the basis of the whole subsequent narrative. But, whoever was the Elohist, it appears that some later writer, the Jehovist, has not only added largely to his story, but directly *contradicted* it in many particulars, and especially by using from the very first the name Jehovah. From this it is evident that this later writer did not recognise it as an undoubted fact in the history of Israel, that the Name was first revealed to Moses in the way, and at the time, which is indicated in E.vi.2–7. In other words, he did not really believe that Moses himself had written the Elohistic narrative, containing the genuine, divinely-infallible report of his awful communications with God.

# APPENDICES.

# APPENDIX I.

## THE ISRAELITISH ORIGIN OF THE SANCTUARY AT MECCA.

1. Prof. Dozy of Leyden, in his work lately published, *De Israelieten te Mekka*, (Haarlem, 1864), has given to the world an exceedingly interesting account of his researches into the early history of the sanctuary at Mecca and of the religion which existed there before the time of Mohammed. His reasoning is very ingenious and original; and the conclusions to which he has arrived are of considerable importance, in their bearing upon the early history of Israel, and especially on the results arrived at in this volume. I shall here endeavour to set before the English reader an abstract of the chief points in these new discoveries, stating them generally in Prof. Dozy's own words, but not confining myself to these, nor following exactly the course of his argument. I shall rather treat the subject in my own way, and on some points of detail shall have occasion to express a difference of opinion from his. But the merit of having first made these investigations, and applied his intimate knowledge of Arabian writers, to throw light upon some obscure passages of Scripture, and reveal a hitherto unknown portion of Israelitish history, is entirely his own.

2. In the body of this Part (207) as well as in (III.817), I have drawn attention to the fact that the tribe of Simeon seems to have altogether disappeared at a very early age from the history of Israel. The 'sons of Simeon'—*i.e.* in Oriental phraseology, the divisions of the tribe—are summed-up *four* times in the Bible, G.xlvi.10, E.vi.15, N.xxvi.12,13, 1Ch.iv.24; of which notices the second appears to have been merely copied from the first, and the last two differ from the former and from each other. In Ju.i.3, &c., we find Simeon helping his brother Judah against the Canaanites, but playing a subordinate part; and in *v.*17 we read—'And Judah went with Simeon his brother, and they slew the Canaanites that inhabited Zephath, and made a *kherem* * of it. And they called the name of the

* 'Under the name *kherem* is to be understood whatever was devoted to a Deity, and could not be taken back again. It might be a person, a head of cattle, a piece of land, or anything else: but whatever it might be, that was once dedicated to the Deity, became and for ever remained his property; it could never be redeemed; it became 'most holy.' [L.xxvii.21,28.] Also the enemies of the Deity were

city (Khormah) Hormah.' We find, indeed, another notice of this very same transaction in N.xxi.2,3; but this is put too soon, during the lifetime of Moses, (when Israel had not yet entered Canaan), and the act is ascribed to 'Israel,' instead of merely to Judah and Simeon. Hormah, in fact, appears as a Simeonite town in Jo.xix.4, where it is named as one of the seventeen towns, with their villages, which were assigned to this tribe. Most of these towns lay in the SW. of Palestine, on the borders of Arabia and the Philistine territory.

3. But the facts—that Simeon went against the Canaanites only as a dependent of Judah,—that his seventeen towns are described as *qll* lying 'within the inheritance of the children of Judah,' Jo.xix.1,—that in the time of Saul and David *six* of these are actually reckoned either to Judah or to the Philistines, while almost all of them are included in the list of the towns of Judah in Jo.xv,—show, as we have said (208), that the Simeonites had very little power, and had probably never been able to acquire an independent position. And, accordingly, in the Blessing of Jacob, written, as we have seen reason to conclude, in the earlier part of David's reign, they are spoken of as 'portioned-out in Jacob and scattered in Israel.'

4. Still the Simeonites are mentioned in Jacob's Blessing as actually existing, though in much the same forlorn condition as the tribe of Levi: whereas, even in Solomon's time, they seem to have disappeared altogether. They are not named after the separation of the Ten Tribes, as forming part of the kingdom of Judah, to which from their local position they would have necessarily belonged. We read of Judah and Benjamin supporting Rehoboam, 1K.xii.21; but Simeon is never mentioned again in the history of the Book of Kings. He is not named at all in the Song of Moses, D.xxxiii, written, as we believe, not long before Josiah's time; and, though occurring in Ez.xlviii.24, it is only in a prophetical vision, in which he appears as one of the restored tribes in the time of the Messiah.

5. Something peculiar, then, it would seem must have happened to the tribe of Simeon during the interval between the composition of G.xlvi and the death of Solomon. It has been said, indeed, that this tribe may have dwindled away, or become absorbed in the tribe of Judah. These explanations of the matter, how-

---

devoted to him, *i.e.* the persons or peoples, who worshipped another god: but these could be devoted to the Deity in no other way than by death, [L.xxvii.29], and in this case the *kherem* was a ban of the most fearful kind. Still there was even here a distinction; there were different degrees of *kherem*; for they put to death (i) only the men, (ii) only the men and the women who had known man, (iii) all except the maids, (iv) all the human beings, men, women, and children, reserving the cattle and other property as booty, (v) all human beings and cattle, the gold, silver, &c. being dedicated to the Sanctuary, (vi) all human beings and cattle, the property and the place being also destroyed utterly. The locality, which before, or at, or after, the extermination of the enemies of the Deity, was devoted to him, was itself called *kherem* or *khormah*, and no stranger, no undevoted person, might enter it; if any did, they must be put to death.' Dozy, *p.*77.

ever, are merely conjectures, though such as might be admitted as plausible if there were no better way of accounting for this phenomenon. And, indeed, these causes of their disappearance may very well have coexisted to some extent with the main reason of which we are about to speak; more especially as the numbers of armed men of Simeon, which are reckoned as 59,300 at the first census in the wilderness, N.i.23, ii.13, are reduced to 22,200 at the second, N.xxvi.14. But there is a singular narrative in the Book of Chronicles, to which Prof. Dozy seems for the first time to have directed close attention, and which, as he observes, 'may give us a clue to lead us out of the maze of mere conjecture into the field of historical certainty.'

6. 'The Book of Chronicles,' he adds, *p.*49, 'is, it is true, of a very late age: it contains for the most part modifications of accounts which we possess in other Books in a more trustworthy form, and it is not always deserving of credit. But this does not prevent its containing also some valuable passages, which are found nowhere else: and such is that to which I now refer. It is an old account—dating, as the Chronicler says, out of the time of Hezekiah; and there is no reason to doubt the truth of this statement. . . . In fact, if the Chronicler himself had invented the narrative, he would afterwards, we may be sure, have made some use of it: whereas he never refers to it, but on the contrary gives plain evidence afterwards that he has actually forgotten it. Nor is there here any trace to be found of the *purpose*, which in other instances has induced this writer to modify, or to invent, certain pieces of history.'

7. The passage in question is 1Ch.iv.24–43, which gives an account of the 'sons of Simeon,' with their towns and villages, and ends as follows, *v.*39–43:—

'[39] And they went until they came to Gedor, unto the east of the valley, to seek pasture for their flocks. [40] And they found pasture, fat and good, and the land wide on both hands, and quiet and peaceable; for out of Ham were those dwelling there previously. [41] And there went these, written by names in the days of Hezekiah king of Judah, and smote their tents, and the *Minæans* * who were found there, and made a *kherem* of them unto this day, and dwelt in their place; for there was pasture for their flocks there.

[42] And out of them, out of the sons of Simeon, there went to Mount Seir five hundred men, and Pelatiah, and Neariah, and Rephaiah, and Uzziel, sons of Ishi, at their head. [43] And they smote the remnant that escaped of Amalek, and dwelt there unto this day.'

8. It is plain that the above records a *migration* of the Simeonites, and upon a somewhat large scale. Two questions now arise, *Whither?* and *When?*

---

* In *v.*41 we find 'they smote their tents and the *Mĕhinim*,' that is, *Minæans*, in accordance with the LXX, καὶ ἐπάταξαν τοὺς οἴκους αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς Μιναίους: and this reading is, no doubt, correct, since הִכָּה, 'smite,' is used of lifeless objects, *e.g.* 'tents,' 2Ch.xiv.14, as well as of men. But the Masorites have changed הַמְּעִנִים into הַמְּעוֹנִים, 'the dwellings.'

As to the question '*Whither?*' we perceive that a smaller body of them, five hundred, went to *Mount Seir*, and settled there. But this expression includes all the mountainous district of Northern Arabia; and we cannot from this text alone define the spot where these five hundred settled.

The greater body, we are told, went to '*Gedor*': but where was that? BERTHEAU says, truly enough, it cannot be the 'Gedor' in the mountains of Judah, Jo.xv.58; and so he adopts with EWALD the reading of the LXX, *viz.* 'Gerar,' *i.e.* גרר for גדר. But Gerar lay on the southern border of Palestine, close by the Simeonite town of Beersheba,—so close, in fact, that CYRIL (comm. on Amos) took it for Beersheba itself; whereas the Chronicler's account implies plainly a migration to some more distant place.

9. Besides, the Chronicler says that *Hamites* lived there originally: whereas, according to Genesis, the *Philistines* inhabited Gerar; and though these, indeed, are numbered, somewhat loosely, among the descendants of Ham in G.x.14, yet they certainly spoke a Hebrew dialect, and the Chronicler, if he wished to be understood, would scarcely have spoken of *Hamites*, if he merely meant the Philistines of Gerar. In fact, if the Simeonites merely made a step, as it were, beyond their own boundary, so as to conquer Gerar, why are they not mentioned after Solomon's death, as taking part with Judah and Benjamin?

10. Again, at 'Gedor,' we are told, among these Hamites, dwelt 'the *Minæans*,' —'strangers,' says BERTHEAU, 'who lived in this region among the descendants of Ham.' This, however, is the name of an ancient Arabian people of great renown, which by its commerce became one of the richest in the whole peninsula. The Minæans, says GESENIUS, lived *too far south*, to be meant in the passage before us, —as if the Simeonites might not have gone 'far south,' but must have remained close to Palestine! So the Masoretic reading was preferred, but explained as a Proper Name, *viz.* the *Mahonim* or *Mehonim*, so called from the town *Mahon*, near Petra (BERTHEAU, after ROBINSON). But here again we have the same difficulty as with Gerar, *viz.* that the place was *too near*. Thus we have not yet found the proper answer to the question, '*Whither?*'

11. As to the question '*When?*' almost all commentators fix the time of this emigration in the reign of Hezekiah. But, if so, how is it that, after Solomon's death, the Simeonites are not named with the men of Judah and Benjamin? In fact, *v.*41 does not say that they 'migrated' in Hezekiah's time, but that *their names were registered*—a list was taken of them—in that king's days, which list the Chronicler very probably had before him. The *time* of the migration is really indicated in *v.*31, 'These were their towns *until the reign of David.*' From this it follows, says Prof. DOZY, that the Simeonites inhabited the thirteen towns just named, *v.*28–31, *during Saul's time*, but *not afterwards*, so that the migration took place *before* David's time under the reign of Saul.

12. But we should rather infer, from the above expression, that the migration took place some time *during* the reign of David: *comp.* the phrase 'unto this day,' which implies that the matter referred to was still existing *at* 'this day.' In our

view, the Simeonites in the early part of David's reign, when 'Jacob's Blessing' was written, were still living in Canaan, and inhabiting their thirteen cities—but *not exclusively*—not as an independent tribe. These towns were *mainly* inhabited by men of Judah, and hence they are regularly reckoned to Judah. The Simeonites, like the Levites, were 'portioned-out and scattered' in Israel, G.xlix.7, living as subordinates and dependents in the towns of others. The Chronicler, indeed, speaks of 7,100 Simeonites, 'mighty men of valour for war,' who joined David at Hebron, 'to turn the kingdom of Saul to him,' 1Ch.xii.23,25. But we cannot place any reliance on the accuracy of this statement, though, if true, it would tend to support our view, that the main body of the tribe had not yet migrated.

13. The fact, that the movement in question took place *about* the time above indicated, is confirmed by the notice in 1Ch.iv.42,43, where we are told that the five hundred Simeonites, who went to Mount Seir, 'smote *the remnant of the Amalekites that had escaped*,' *i.e.* apparently, those who had escaped from David, when he took revenge upon them for the sack of Ziklag, on which occasion, we are told, 'David smote them from the twilight even until the evening of the next day; and there escaped not a man of them, save four hundred young men, who rode upon camels and fled,' 1S.xxx.17. Here, then, we have the five hundred Simeonites attacking the four hundred Amalekites, and slaying them ruthlessly, because they had just plundered the town of Ziklag, one of their own (Simeonite) towns, which, though given by Achish to David, 1S.xxvii.6, very probably contained, even under the Philistine rule, men of Simeon and their families, as well as David's followers and men of Judah,—after which time the Amalekites never appear again in the history of Israel, the reference in 2S.viii.12 being to David's earlier victory now under consideration.

14. At this period, then, *just before the death of Saul*, this smaller body of Simeonites migrated. And, 'as it stands in close connection with the other larger migration, we may conclude,' says Prof. Dozy, 'that the latter took place about the same time.'

But, surely, the larger migration would be likely to take place *after*, not before, the smaller one. Perhaps the success of the latter may have even given rise to the other. In other words, it seems more probable that the greater migration occurred *during* David's reign,—perhaps, in the first decade of it, not long after G.xlix.5–7 was written—rather than *before* it, during the reign of Saul.

15. Did this larger migration include the *whole* tribe of Simeon? The answer is, No. In 1Ch.iv.28–31, *thirteen* towns are named, of which it is said 'These were their towns until the reign of David.' And then follows a list of *five* other towns, *v.*32,33,—a phenomenon which we observe also in Jo.xix.2–7, except that *four* towns are here named in the second list, instead of five. It would seem that the population of the thirteen towns had emigrated in David's time, while the inhabitants of the four (or five) had remained behind. And these last, being so few in number, and these few mixed up largely, as we suppose, with men of Judah, would naturally not be reckoned separately from the tribe of Judah, which would occupy completely the other thirteen towns, now altogether abandoned by the Simeonites.

16. Prof. Dozy, however, supposes that they must have been *compelled* to this migration by some special event in their history, and he suggests that they may have been forcibly expelled for sparing Agag, and the best of the flocks and herds of Amalek, as described in 1S.xv, instead of making a complete *kherem* of them as commanded. And he quotes in support of this conjecture an Arabian legend, as follows:

'When Moses had conquered Canaan, he commanded a numerous force to go and make a *kherem* of the Amalekites, who inhabited the whole region of Khigaz. They, accordingly, killed them all, even their king el-Arkam, but not his son, whom they spared on account of his youth and beauty, and reserved for the decision of Moses. When they returned to the main body, Moses was dead; and the other Israelites declared that, since they had not obeyed the command of their Prophet, they should not be allowed to live any longer in the land of Canaan. Then said they, 'Since you expel us, there is no better land than that which we have just left.' Khigaz, in fact, in those days was rich in wood and water: so they went back, gave their cattle pasture, and built dwellings and fortresses, and were joined by some Arabian tribes.'

17. The agreement between the above account and that of 1S.xv is obvious, as is also the mistake of naming *Moses* instead of *Samuel*,* of whom, indeed, the Arabs know nothing, as, according to the Koran, the Israelites desired a king immediately after the death of Moses. Saul, indeed, is spoken of by them, but is confounded with Gideon; while Samuel is not named at all, though mention is made of some prophet who lived in Saul's time. The king is here called *Arkam*, not *Agag*. But *Agag* is merely a title, meaning 'king,' and *Tabarî* says the same of *Arkam*, Heb. רֶקֶם, *Rekem*, which we find as the name of one of the kings of Midian, N.xxxi.8.

On this account Prof. Dozy is disposed to place the migration in the days of Saul. But his argument here, though very ingenious, does not appear to me convincing. There is no indication in the Scripture narrative that the Simeonites were more guilty than others on the above occasion. Rather, Saul speaks of the *people*, generally, as having spared the choice of the 'sheep and oxen,' *v.*15,21, and of *himself* as having spared Agag, *v.*20; and so, too, the history says that 'Saul and the people,' (200,000 footmen, and 10,000 men of Judah, *v.*4) spared Agag and the best of the sheep and oxen, &c. *v.*9.

---

* It is remarkable that in the only passage of the Prophets before the Captivity where Moses is mentioned at all, Jer.xv.1, he is coupled with Samuel, 'Though Moses and Samuel stood before me.' This close association—and, in the Arabian tradition, *confusion*—of Samuel with Moses may have a significance in relation to the fact that Samuel was, most probably, the Elohistic writer, who laid the basis of the Pentateuchal story about Moses. Perhaps, the oldest (so-called) *Mosaic* laws were in reality *Samuelic*, and Samuel himself was the actual lawgiver, instead of Moses, to whom was first revealed the depth of meaning which lay hid from common eyes in the name 'JHVH.'

18. Upon the whole, I adhere to the belief that the migration may have taken place chiefly for *want of room*, and to relieve the necessities of their condition as described in G.xlix.7. The Simeonites were a poor dependent tribe, like the Levites, when that passage was written in the early part of David's reign—without lands or towns of their own. The Levites were relieved by being employed by David for sacred purposes: the Simeonites—perhaps about the same time—relieved themselves by migration. It is quite possible, however, that the Arabian story, to which Prof. Dozy refers, may have been based on some traditions—imperfect in some respects—as to the memorable event in which their forefathers had been *last* engaged, not long before their leaving Canaan, *viz.* the great war of extermination in Saul's time against the Amalekites. And they may have even seen the good land of 'Gedor' at this time, and some years afterwards set off to seize it.

19. We have now sufficiently replied to the question '*When?*' having determined that the smaller migration of the Simeonites very probably took place near the end of Saul's reign, and the greater migration about the middle of David's. Let us return to the consideration of the question '*Whither?*'

'They smote their tents and the Minæi who were found there.' These 'Minæi'* seem to have been unknown to the Mohammedan writers; but they are often named by the Greeks and Romans. Strabo, xvi.*p.*768 C (ed. *Kramer*), says that the four great nations, which inhabited the SW. parts of Arabia were 'the Minæi in that part which lies by the Red Sea,† whose chief town is Karna or Karnana,—on their confines the Sabæi, whose chief town is Mariaba,—the third people, the Kattabanes, whose land reaches to the strait, where the Arabian Gulf is crossed (*i.e.* the Straits of Bab-el-Mandeb), the residence of whose king is Tamna,—lastly, the most easterly, the people of Hadramaut, where is the town of Sabata.'

20. It will be seen that Strabo, in describing the first three nations, follows the direction from north to south, and sets the Minæi the most northerly of all, more to the north than the Sabæi with their famous town, Mariaba, the 'Mareb' of the later Arabs. Strabo's datum, then, would allow us to place the Minæi in the north of Yemen, and to the south of Khigaz. But it was, as the ancients testify, a great people, and seems to have stretched itself very far to the north.

21. This may be inferred from Pliny, *H.N.* VI.xxviii.157 (ed. *Sillig*), where,

---

* In Job ii.11, &c. we have 'Zophar the *Naamathite*,' for which the LXX have Σωφὰρ Μιναίων βασιλεύς. How is this to be explained? Dozy suggests that instead of הנעמתי, should be read הרעמתי, 'the *Raamathite*'; for the Minæi, says Pliny, were a brother-folk of the Rhammei, and these inhabited the Sabæan town of 'Raamah,' רַעְמָה, LXX, Ῥαμμά, G.x.7, Ez.xxvii.22, and the Alex. translator has used the name which was more common and well-known in his time. From G.x.7 it appears that the Rammæi, and therefore also the Minæi, were regarded as *Hamites*.

† Marcian. Heracl. places them on the coast of the Red Sea, *Geog. Gr. Min.* (ed. *Müller*) I.*p.*527, and Uranius does the same (*Fragm. Hist. Gr.* iv.*p.*525).

however, the text should be corrected, as follows (he is numbering the peoples in Arabia from north to south), 'Tamudæi, oppidum Badanatha,—Carrei, oppidum Cariati,—Achoali, oppidum [Foth ac Minæi, for which read] Fothac,—Minæi, &c.' where Fothac = Fadak, frequently named in the old Arabian history, and in that of Mohammed's time. The Achoali also of PLINY are represented in later times under the name of 'the 'Owâl' near Fadak. From the above, then, it may be inferred that the northern boundary of the Minæi was not far from Medina. And this seems to be confirmed by the fact that STRABO, as we have seen, names their chief town 'Karna,' and PTOLEMY names a town 'Karna' immediately after 'Jathrippa' = Jathrib, the name of 'Medina' before Mohammed's time.

22. The Minæi, then, whose wide territory stretched northward to the neighbourhood of Medina, and far to the south, were found upon the spot whither the Simeonites went, though they were not the only dwellers there. And the Simeonites 'made a kherem of them *unto this day*, and dwelt in their place.' Whether this expression, 'unto this day,' belongs properly to the Chronicler, or to the record from Hezekiah's time which he was copying, it is plain that the 'kherem' in question was not a passing one,—as a mere massacre would have been,—but a permanent one, in other words, a *dedication* of land, &c. to the service of the Deity.

23. Was there, then, any such a holy locality, dedicated to the Divine Being, in Arabia? We have not to look far. There is one spot in Arabia, and only one spot in the whole country, which, as far back as the memory of the Arabian reaches, has become the name *kherem* or *kharam*,—(the Arabs have the same mark for *a* and *e*) —and that is the holy ground of MECCA. Wherever the name is found elsewhere, it is of later origin, and given in imitation, (as *e.g.* Mohàmmed declared Medina a *kherem*); and, wherever else there is a holy ground attached to a temple, it is called by the true Arabic name *khimâ*. Only the ground at Mecca, then, can possibly be meant in the passage of Chronicles. Its boundaries were marked by stones or pillars, which strangers—those who worshipped another deity—might not cross.

24. And this is strongly confirmed by the very name MECCA itself. The Arabians, as is well known, have a very defective way of indicating the vowels: for all the vowels they have only three signs, so that the same sign serves for *a* and *e*, and the choice depends on the reader's will. But *Makkah*, as some Oriental scholars of the present day (*e.g.* SPRENGER, OSIANDER, KREHL) write it, is the true, the ancient, pronunciation. Another form of *Makkah* is *Bakkah*, which certain Arabian writers distinguish, making (as some) Makkah the holy district and Bakkah the place of the temple, or (as others) Makkah the town and Bakkah the temple, &c. But a number of others regard Makkah and Bakkah as the same name, with the interchange, so very common in Semitic tongues, of *m* and *b*. This, according to *Bekrî*, was the view of most, if not of all, linguistic scholars.

25. Makkah, then, is to be regarded as by far the most usual form of the name; and the question now arises, can it be explained from the Arabic tongue? The Arabian philologers give us, indeed, *six* different attempts at such derivation—all equally droll. The root *Makkah* denotes, (α) 'suck out entirely,' (β) 'diminish,'

(γ) 'level with the ground'; and from these meanings that of the name Makkah is derived, as follows. The place is so called from (α) (i) because there is little water there, which is soon 'sucked out,' or (ii) because men stream thither from all places, and Makkah 'sucks out' all lands, or from (β) because Makkah lowers the pride of the haughty, or (iv) from (γ) because Makkah abolishes and gets rid of sin; or else it is derived (v) from the form *tamakkakah*, 'be pressing,' because the crowd is so great that men press upon each other there, or lastly (vi) from the same word in the sense 'extract the marrow out of a bone,' because the men of Makkah extract the marrow out of all science.

26. It would be idle to discuss more closely the above. Only this is plain that the word Makkah cannot be derived from the Arabic, that it is no Arabic word. But we have only to write Makkah in *Hebrew*, מַכָּה, and we have gone very far to explain its meaning, *viz.* 'slaughter.' This noun, however, is usually employed with an adjective, which was afterwards omitted for brevity's sake; and PTOLEMY has preserved this very adjective for us. For he names a certain place *Makoraba*, and, that he means Makkah, is plain from the degrees of long. and lat. which he gives; so that *Makoraba* and *Makkah* have long been regarded as identical, *e.g.* by the most eminent geographers of our time, as RITTER (*Erdkunde*, xii.*p.*15,231) and KEIPERT (*Atlas der Alten Welt*, *p.*9, col.3).

27. On the other hand, the eastern scholars of the present day seldom or never speak of Makoraba: they know that the town Makkah was first built in the fifth century of our era, and therefore they suppose that PTOLEMY cannot have named it. And this would be very true, if Makkah and Makoraba denoted anciently a *town*: but this was not the case. Even with Arabian authors, the word occurs in another sense. Thus in *Bekrî* (HS. 421, i. *p.*51) we read, 'The descendants of Fihr remained round about Makkah till Kozei-ibn-Kilâb made them live upon the *khêrem* (holy ground).' At Makkah there was nobody. HISÂM says on the authority of al-Kelbî, 'All the men had performed the pilgrimage, they had dispersed; Makkah remained then forsaken, there was nobody there.' Here there can be no mention of a *town*, for there was no town as yet; but the name 'Makkah' is employed nevertheless.

28. We have only now to write in Hebrew letters מַכָּה־רַבָּה, and we have at once *Makkah-rabbah*, = PTOLEMY'S *Makoraba*, meaning 'great slaughter,' exactly the expression which we find in N.xi.33, 'Jehovah smote among the people a very *great slaughter* (מַכָּה־רַבָּה),' or 2Ch.xiii.17, 'Abijah and his people smote among them a *great slaughter*': *comp.* also 1S.xiv.30. The synonym מַכָּה־גְדוֹלָה, *makkah-gèdolah*, occurs frequently, *e.g.* Jo.x.10,20, Ju xi.33, xv.8, &c. It is not surprising that the Arabians, not knowing Hebrew, could not give the right explanation of the name.

29. But, if we look now at the passage in Chronicles, we shall see that just exactly at the place, which 'was made a *kherem* unto this day,' the Simeonites had made a great slaughter among the inhabitants—the writer, in fact, using the verb הִכָּה, 'smite,' from the same root as מַכָּה, which occurs in both the above-quoted passages, N.xi.33, 2Ch.xiii.17. What more natural than that this field of

blood should have acquired the name *Makkah-rabbah*, 'great slaughter,' and that the place itself, so horribly defiled, should have been set apart from all human touch, as a *kherem* devoted to the Deity?

30. But what Deity was this? In Mohammed's time the chief Deity at Mecca was *Hobal*. His image was of agate-stone, in the form of a man, which, after the capture of Mecca, was broken in pieces by Mohammed's orders. An Arabian Deity it certainly was not: for the name is not Arabic. In fact, the Arabians say that it came to them from abroad: but they give different accounts of its history, —as, *e.g.* that their prince Hamr-ibn-Lokhei, who lived about A.D. 200, brought it to Mecca—some say from Hith in Mesopotamia, others from *Moab, where then the Amalekites lived.* But these are mere fables, which have arisen from the endeavour of Mohammed and his followers to represent pure Monotheism as the original religion of the Arabians. Hamr-ibn-Lokhei was the *scapegoat*, upon whom all the sins of the people before Mohammed's time were laid, and among others this and all other idolatries. Yet even this opinion did not universally prevail. The writer of the *Marâzid* (III. *p.*305, ed. *Juynboll*) speaks of Hobal, but says not a word about Hamr-ibn-Lokhei; according to him, Chozeima, who lived about a century earlier, placed the idol in the temple. It is plain, there was no constant tradition about it.

31. Who or what, then, was Hobal? Two centuries ago Pococke (*Spec. Hist. Arab.*, *p.*98, ed. *White*) guessed rightly, though with him it was a mere guess, that the name was הַבַּעַל, *hab-Baal*. In fact, the name בעל is easily corrupted into בל, by omission of the guttural. In Punic names this latter form occurs frequently—in their Roman representatives always, (*e.g.* Asdrubal, Hannibal,)—and in Aramæan it is usual. The change of Habbal into Hobbal or Hobal will surprise no one, since in Arabic the change of the *a* sound into *o* is common.

And Prof. Dozy in his Introduction proceeds to give reasons for believing that 'in Saul's time, when the Simeonites left Canaan, Baal was the chief Deity of the Israelites.'

32. We have seen that some of higher mind in that age, as Samuel and David, and the Prophets and Psalmists of that time, had more correct ideas of the Divine Being, and laboured to turn their countrymen from their idolatries. And such as these, it would seem, in their private devotions, and in the forms of prayer and praise which they composed for public use, used first 'Elohim,' and then, more and more freely by degrees, the mysterious name 'JHVH,' with a reverential awe, and expressions of trust and love,—giving thus plain evidence that they had begun already to realise, by Divine Inspiration, a true idea of the glorious perfections of the One Only True and Living God. It is plain, however, from the facts which we have had before us in Chap.xix,xx, that to the *people* generally, in that day and for centuries afterwards, even down to the Captivity, the name 'JHVH' was but another name for '*the* Baal,' (*comp.* '*the* El,' G.xlvi.3,)—that is, the great Phœnician Baal, whom they worshipped with all manner of impure and unhallowed practices.

33. With our view, therefore, it accords perfectly that the Simeonites, if they

left the land of Canaan in the beginning of David's reign, when, as Ps.lx and Ps.lxviii show, the name 'JHVH' was not yet commonly used in devotional compositions by eminent and pious writers, should have taken with them the worship of Baal—of *Hobal = hab-Baal, i.e.* '*the* Baal,' or the Great Deity of the tribes of Canaan—but should *not* have handed down to future years the name 'JHVH.' That name was probably adopted first among the *northern* tribes, who settled in the district where the worship of Adonis was localised (*App.*III.12). It might not have reached the Simeonites at all, at the extreme SW. of Canaan, at the time of their migration. If it had, and if they took it with them, it might not yet have acquired for them any great significance, and so might soon have been dropped out of use and forgotten. Some of the names, however, in 1Ch.iv.34–37 are compounded with Jehovah, and, *if genuine*, would show that they knew it.

34. At all events, the very fact before us, *viz.* that no trace of the name 'JHVH' appears to have existed in connection with the ancient worship at Mecca, would be a very strong proof—if the Simeonitish origin of Mecca and its worship be admitted—that this name had never been familiar and endeared to the Israelites as the great name of the God of Israel—still less had been known to them for centuries as the name of their covenant-God, who had led them through so many dangers in the wilderness, and settled them securely in Canaan. In other words, it would be a strong proof that the narrative of the Pentateuch, in respect of the origin of this name, is not historically true, and that the name 'JHVH' was introduced into the religious history of Israel at a later date than the time of the Exodus.

35. Prof. Dozy suggests also, and attempts to prove by a very ingenious piece of criticism, that there appears to have been a special connection of the Simeonites with the particular Baal who was worshipped at Mecca.

The Book of Azrakî in several places mentions that in the temple at Mecca, under the image of Hobal, on the right-hand, was a pit of 4½ feet deep. The pit was the treasury of the Sanctuary; into it the presents were thrown, gold, silver, ornaments, incense, &c.; and the treasure itself long survived its ancient possessor. Mohammed and his follower Abu-Bekr left it untouched. The Khalif Omar wished to distribute it among the poor; but his friends—Ali especially—dissuaded him; they shared in the general feeling that it was 'most holy,' and must not be touched. 'One of the guardians,' says Azrakî, 'in the year 188 (A.D. 804), told Mahommed Ibu-Jakhjâ, that the treasures were still in the treasury.'

The usual Arabian name for this pit, as appears from Azrakî, was *gobb* = 'well;' but it was also called *ber*, meaning also, as the Heb. בְּאֵר, *bĕer*, 'well.' This was, as is seen clearly in Azrakî, the true, ancient, original, Hebrew name; just as in the Koran, Sur.xii, in the story of Joseph, *gobb* is used for the pit into which he was thrown, where the Heb. of Genesis, has *bor* = *bĕer*,—the Arabians not usually employing *ber* for a pit without water.

36. Now in Jo.xix.8, (at the end of the list of the Simeonite towns,) we read at present as follows—'and all the villages that were round about these towns to *Baalath Beer, Ramath of the south*, (עַד־בַּעֲלַת בְּאֵר רָאמַת נֶגֶב).' But the Hebrew is here corrupted: there are two towns named, as the Arabic translation

shows, inserting 'and' before 'Ramath.' And, in fact, the very place itself is named, *viz.* 'Ramoth-Negeb,' among the towns of Judah, (including some of Simeon), to which David sent presents, 1S.xxx.27. Again, the passage in 1Ch.iv.33, which is the counterpart of Jo.xix.8, has 'and all the villages that were round about these towns unto *Baal.*' Observing, then, that רֹאמֹת may have arisen from ראמת, which is used in D.iv.43, *comp.* Jo.xx.8,1Ch.vi.73(58),80(65), instead of the more usual form רָמוֹת, and that ת and ה may be easily confounded, Prof. Dozy suggests that the whole passage in Joshua should be read עַד־בַּעַל הַבְּאֵר וְרָמוֹת נֶגֶב, 'unto *Baal of the Pit* (*Well*) and Ramoth-Negeb.' This would seem to imply that the Baal of Mecca was only the copy of that which they had left behind in Canaan, which last stood, no doubt, as that at Mecca did, over a pit, into which the gifts to the Deity were thrown.

37. Probably, the Canaanitish *Baal of the Pit* was no town, but only a temple or sanctuary, standing within a sacred enclosure.* This was the case with that at Mecca, where the temple was built most simply, consisting merely of four walls of uncemented stones, 45 feet long, 33 feet wide, and 13½ feet high, and was entered by a single door. The four walls—or in other words, the whole building—were called collectively *al-gadr* or *al-gidâr*, = 'the walled enclosure.' In Hebrew, the words *gader*, *geder*, *gederah*, *gedor*, have exactly the same meaning, so that many towns in Palestine were so called from the walls which enclosed them, *comp.* Jo.xii.13, xv.36,41,58, 1Ch.xii.7, &c. So the Phœnician colony in Spain was called from its walls *Gader*, which became with the Romans *Gades*, and is now *Cadiz*. From all this Prof. Dozy infers that the 'Gedor' which is mentioned in 1Ch.iv.39, is simply the 'stone-enclosure' at Mecca.

38. And he confirms this from 2Ch.xxvi.7, where we read that 'God helped Uzziah against the Philistines, and against *the Arabians that dwelt in Gur-Baal* and *the Mehunim.*' The 'Mehunim' are, as before, the 'Minæans,' *i.e.* we should read חמעינים for המעונים, and accordingly the LXX has ἐπὶ τοὺς Μιναίους. But what is Gur-Baal, גור בעל? No one has been able to make out; and Winer, in his *Bibl. RW.* I.*p.*447, writes thus: 'Gur-Baal, a district, as it would seem,† inhabited by Arabians, but on the borders of Judea,‡ 2Ch. xxvi.7. The Targumist has, 'the Arabians that dwelt in Gerar,' [reading בגרר]. We can

* This may, perhaps, be indicated by the juxta-position of the two names in Jo.xix.8. Ramoth-Negeb, lit. 'high-places of the south,' may have been the name of the village or town, near which this famous southern Sanctuary stood. Hence the two names may have been written correctly one after the other, *without* the article, as in the Heb. Text, one being in apposition to the other, and the two together denoting only one locality. This also may explain why *only* 'Ramoth-Negeb' is named in 1S.xxx.27, and *only* 'Baal' in 1Ch.iv.33. *Ed.*

† Not 'as it would seem': the Chronicler says it expressly. Dozy.

‡ This does not at all appear from the place cited, the only one where this name occurs. Dozy.

produce nothing to clear up this geographical word. Nor can the name be explained etymologically.'

39. But, observing that the 'Minæans' are here closely connected with these Arabians,—so closely that the preposition עַל, 'against,' which stands before 'the Arabians,' is not repeated before 'the Minæans,' whence it would appear that Uzziah's conflict took place with both *together*,—what if we write not גֵּרָר, as the Targumist, but גְּדֹר, instead of גּוֹר? We have then simply 'Gedor-Baal,' the 'stone-enclosure of Baal?' In other words, Uzziah fought with the Arabians who lived about Mecca, and their allies the Minæans, living (as we have seen) in their neighbourhood, who may, perhaps, have joined in attacking Uzziah's people, when he 'built Eloth'—the port Æla, at the head of the Ælanitic Gulf of the Red Sea—'and *restored it to Judah*,' after his father's death, 2Ch.xxvi.2. More than two centuries had now elapsed since the Simeonite migration; and mixed up as they were, no doubt, with Arabian tribes, it is very intelligible that the people about Mecca are here called 'Arabians.'

40. The Alex. version of the Chronicles—'one of the best portions,' says BERTHEAU quoted by MOVERS, 'of the Greek translation,' and whose excellence is universally admitted—renders the passage, 2Ch.xxvi.7, thus, *ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἀραβας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς Μιναίους*; that is, in place of 'Gedor-Baal' they have read *ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας*, 'at the stone.' What does this mean? 'The ancients,' says FRESNEL, himself acquainted with Arabia, 'knew the interior of Arabia Felix better than we do.' Above all, the Alexandrians were well-acquainted with Arabia. In Ptolemy's time there was an active intercourse between Egypt and Arabia, and both the admirable accounts of Arabia by Eratosthenes and Agatharchides, and the Greek translation of the O. T., date from that time. Observing this, we can have little doubt that the translator of the Chronicles meant by his expression, 'at the stone,' to indicate the renowned, holy, black stone of Mecca. He has thus in another way, but probably more intelligibly for his contemporaries, expressed the same as the Hebrew writer by his 'Gedor-Baal.'

41. Once more, it now stands, in 1Ch.iv.39, וַיֵּלְכוּ לְמְבוֹא גְדֹר עַד לְמִזְרַח הַגָּיְא, 'and they went until they came to Gedor, *as far as to the east of the Valley*,' LXX, *ἕως τῶν ἀνατολῶν τῆς Γαί*.' Here the LXX have translated הגיא as a proper name, which was very probably applied to the valley in which the Sanctuary at Mecca stands,—just exactly as a valley between Mecca and Medina was called *Ge*, and as, in fact, Mecca itself is now called by the Arabs *al-wâdî*, 'the Valley.' But the awkward expression עַד לְ, though common with the later Chronicler, would certainly not have been used in the extract out of Hezekiah's time. And, observing that in 2Ch.xxvi.7, the place is called 'Gedor-Baal,' it seems very possible that here גדר עד has taken the place of the *original* גדר בעל. In fact, the later Jews have repeatedly expressed their abhorrence of the name 'Baal,' by altering it in the Sacred Text in places where it stood originally, as it would here, in connection with *Israelites*,* though they have left it in others

* Thus in Samuel the names Eshbaal, Meribbaal, Baalyadah, (which are still

where it affected only *foreignors*, as the Arabians in 2Ch.xxvi.7. It would now run—'until they came to Gedor-Baal, to the east of the Valley'—where the name 'Gedor-Baal,' would be used by a prolepsis, as *e.g.* 'Ebenezer' is used in 1S.iv.1, v.1, before the name is given in 1S.vii.12.

42. We have now finished the examination of the passage in Chronicles, though we have by no means exhausted the proofs of Prof. Dozy's position. We have done enough, however, to show the very great importance of his researches, and to commend his book to the attention of English students. It will be seen that his view, as to the worship of Baal having been prevalent in Israel in the time of Saul, and having been most probably established by the Simeonites at Meeca, accords entirely with our own conclusions, which are quite independent of his, and do not on all points agree with them.

---

left in the less-studied Book of Chronicles, 1Ch. viii.33,34, ix.39,40; xiv.7), are changed into Ishbosheth, Mephibosheth, Elyadah, 2S.ii.8, &c. iv.4, &c.v.16. This appears to have been done by the later scribes. Dozy, *p.*43, *note.*

# APPENDIX II.

## THE ELOHISTIC AND JEHOVISTIC PSALMS CONSIDERED, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE REMARKS OF REV. J. J. S. PEROWNE AND THE BISHOP (HAROLD BROWNE) OF ELY.

1. We have seen in the body of this volume (302), that the *Elohist* abstains altogether from using the name Jehovah during the whole of Genesis, and only employs it after he has introduced it as revealed supernaturally to Moses in E.vi.2–7. The *Second Elohist*—whether a different writer from the Jehovist, or the Jehovist himself, as we believe, in the first stage of his literary labour—likewise abstains from using the name Jehovah throughout the Book of Genesis. The *Jehovist*, in those *Jehovistic* passages, which appear to have been *first* written by him *—that is, as we suppose, after he had already written those ascribed to the Second Elohist—uses the name Jehovah, but *not very freely*; and the *Second Jehovist* uses it once. But in his *later* additions the Jehovist uses the name 'Jehovah' habitually, and in his *latest* almost exclusively, as the Personal Name for the Deity.

2. This is, of course, quite in accordance with our view as to the later introduction of the name Jehovah. We suppose that, when the first supplementary insertions were made, this Name was not common in the mouth of the people at large; and the writer therefore naturally adhered to the example which he had before him of the Elohist, his predecessor, in abstaining wholly from the employment of it in the inconsiderable additions made by him at this time to the Book of Genesis. When the next series of interpolations was made, after a further lapse of ten or fifteen years, the name was becoming more familiar; and, accordingly, it drops

---

* Among these we reckon the remarkable passage G.xxi.33, where he records that Abraham 'planted a grove in Beersheba, and called there on the name of *Jehovah, El Everlasting*,'—an expression for the Divine Being, which occurs nowhere else in the Pentateuch, and reads almost as a formula of a *transition* from the older name (Elohim) to the new (Jehovah); and xliii.14,xlix.25 where he uses the old name 'El Shaddai,' which occurs only with the Elohist elsewhere in *the whole Bible*, except Ez.x.5, though 'Shaddai' is used occasionally, but very rarely, except in the Book of Job.

occasionally from the writer's pen. Once more, in still later years, he takes in hand the manuscript, with the purpose of making some further important additions; and now the name is so fully recognised as the Great Name of Israel's God, that he decides to break through altogether the plan of the original writer, and sets the origin of the Name Jehovah far back in the earliest ages. Hence he first inserts G.ii.4$^{b}$–iii.24, in which he couples 'Jehovah' twenty times with 'Elohim,' to show that the Being spoken of under each name is one and the same; then in G.iv he drops 'Elohim,' and henceforward habitually uses 'Jehovah' as the Proper Name of the Deity.

3. It is observable also that in the passages ascribed to the Elohist and Second Elohist we never find any phrase such as 'Elohim of Abraham,' 'Elohim of Isaac,' 'Elohim of my (thy, his, your, their) father,' 'thy Elohim,' except in the promise xvii.8 (E), 'I will be their Elohim,'—all which phrases seem to belong to a time, when 'Jehovah' had been recognised as the name of the national Deity of Israel, and when it was desired to show that this same 'Jehovah' had been the Stay and Strength of their fathers of old in the days of their sojournings. And this, indeed, was substantially true. The Being, the 'Living God,'—whom any of their pious forefathers served, in whom any of them trusted—was the same then as now—the 'El Everlasting'—'the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever'—by whatever Name He might be called among men.

4. But the phenomenon here observed, of the Name 'Jehovah' being gradually used by the Jehovist with greater frequency as time progressed with him, is exactly the same as that which we have noticed in Part II with respect to the Book of Psalms. It was there shown that in those Psalms, which from internal evidence *appear* to be of the oldest date, 'Jehovah' is not used at all, or is used very sparingly, 'Elohim' being almost constantly employed: while in the later Psalms 'Jehovah' is used with much greater frequency, and at last almost exclusively. The difficulty in treating this question arose, we found, from our great uncertainty as to the age of most of the Psalms, the Titles being generally untrustworthy, and the internal evidence not sufficiently decisive to fix the date of their composition.

5. In fact in the whole Book of Psalms there were only *two*, as it seemed to us, which could with a certain degree of confidence be assigned to the age of David. Others *might*, and probably did, belong to it. But the evidence in their case was not conclusive; and it was felt to be unsafe to found any argument upon it. Only with respect to Ps.lx and Ps.lxviii it seemed to us impossible to assign any other age for their composition than the middle part of David's life. And, of these two Psalms, Ps.lx contained 'Elohim' exclusively (E 5,J.0), and Ps.lxviii contained 'Elohim' *thirty-one* times, and 'Adonai' *seven* times, but 'Jehovah' only *four* times. We argued that here was a strong indication—especially in the last grand Psalm, written apparently for some great public occasion, and in fact, as is generally supposed, for that of the bringing-up of the Ark in David's time to the Tabernacle on Mount Zion—that the name 'Jehovah' was *not in common popular use* at the time when these Psalms were written. It seemed impossible that Psalms exhibiting

such phenomena could have been composed by any pious writer, if the case had been otherwise in the age in which they lived, *i.e.* if the Name 'Jehovah' had been fully recognised in their days and habitually employed—at least, by devout and earnest men, such as the writer (or writers) of these Psalms must have been—as the One True Name of the God of Israel.

6. I see no reason whatever at present to abandon the above position: rather, I am strongly confirmed in the conviction that the argument in question is sound, and will bear investigation. It is true that my position on this point has been violently assailed—and somewhat ungenerously, as it seems to me, by some, who were better able than others to appreciate the labour which has been spent by me on this enquiry, and the honest effort which I have made to search after the truth. In Part II I have gone fully into the question with respect to each of these two Psalms, and have not only given at length the reasons for my own views, but have set before the reader those also of HUPFELD, EWALD, OLSHAUSEN, and HENGSTENBERG, the writers whose opinions on the subject it seemed at that time most necessary to consider. I have nothing to change in that portion of my Work, and nothing to withdraw or alter, except on one point of no importance, as noted below. But some additional comments have since come into my hands from writers entitled to respect, and I think it right to submit them here to the reader's consideration, with my own remarks upon them.

7. The Rev. J. J. S. PEROWNE writes generally upon this subject as follows, *Psalms* I.*p.*lxxxiv:—

'No probable explanation of this phenomenon has yet been given. EWALD supposes that the collector of the Second Book *purposely changed the name throughout all these Psalms from Jehovah to Elohim*, influenced, perhaps, by the same sort of superstitious feeling, which prevents the modern Jews from uttering the sacred Name Jehovah. But *there is no foundation for such an hypothesis*, nor is it consistent with the fact that the later Psalms have by preference the name Jehovah.*

'The attempts of HENGSTENBERG and others, and recently of some English critics, [among others, of most of my opponents, *Ed.*] to show that the two names are always used with reference to their distinct meaning,—'Jehovah' as the covenant-God of Israel, 'Elohim' as God, the creator and governor of the world,—*must be regarded as equally unsatisfactory.* One fact entirely overthrows it, *viz.* that *the same Psalm* appears both in a Jehovistic and Elohistic recension.

'Bishop COLENSO's theory is *the most extravagant of all.* As, according to him, Samuel introduced the name Jehovah, so this name is first found in the later Psalms of David,[1] and in those portions of the Pentateuch which are later than Samuel,[2] the Elohistic Psalms being earlier than the Jehovistic sections of the

---

* Still less does it accord with the fact, that 'Jehovah' occurs repeatedly in the Psalms of Book II itself; *e.g.* xlvi(E.7,J.3), xlvii(E.8,J.2), xlviii(E.8,J.2),lv(E.6,J.2), lix(E.9,J.3), lxviii(E.31,J.4), lxix(E.10,J.5), lxx(E.3,J.2), lxxi(E.9,J.3).—*Ed.*

Pentateuch.[3] * But all the facts are against such a theory.[4] The Psalms of the First Book, (which he scarcely notices,[5]) are by the consent of all critics the earliest in the collection,[6] and these are Jehovistic. Many of David's *later* Psalms (as li,lx,lxiii, &c.) are Elohistic, many of his earlier Jehovistic.[7] Other Psalms of the age of Hezekiah, (or at the earliest of Jehoshaphat), as xlvi–xlviii,[8] and Psalms confessedly of the period of the Exile,[9] are Elohistic. How impossible it is to contend that Elohim is a mark of antiquity in a Psalm, Jehovah of a more recent date! This has been well argued by Prof. HAROLD BROWNE (now Bishop of ELY) in his Reply to Bishop COLENSO.[10] His criticisms, both on the Psalms and on the Pentateuch, are, I rejoice to find, on many important points, confirmatory of my own.'

8. To the above I reply as follows.

(1) I have *not* stated that the name Jehovah is '*first found* in the *later* Psalms of David': on the contrary, it is found *four* times in lxviii, which I maintain to be a Psalm out of the *fourteenth* year of David's reign, and earlier than lx, which does not contain Jehovah at all. What I have maintained may be stated thus—*There is not a single Psalm containing 'Jehovah' predominantly, which can be shown from internal evidence to be certainly older than Ps.lxviii.*

(2) Nor have I said that Jehovah is 'first found in those portions of the Pentateuch which are *later* than Samuel'; for I have argued that Samuel used it himself in the later portions of the Elohistic narrative.

(3) Nor have I maintained that 'the Elohistic Psalms are *earlier* than the Jehovistic sections of the Pentateuch': for some of the *Elohistic* Psalms of Book II—*i.e.* Psalms in which 'Elohim' is used *predominantly*—contain repeatedly 'Jehovah,' (as I have shown above, note, *p.*281), and therefore might have been even written by the Jehovist himself.

(4) My 'theory' is this, that Elohistic Psalms, such as lx and lxviii, in which Jehovah occurs not at all, or occurs very rarely in comparison with 'Elohim,' cannot have been written at a time when Jehovah was universally recognised, as the most high and holy name of the God of Israel. I believe these Psalms to belong to the Davidic age. I conclude therefore that in that age the name 'Jehovah,' though it had been for some time used by some devout persons as the name of Israel's God, had not yet acquired universal currency. And I maintain that 'the facts' are *not* 'against such a theory,' while it accords thoroughly with the conclusions, to which I have been led by other perfectly distinct processes of reasoning.

(5) In my First Edition of Part II, I had examined on *p.*324,326–328, *all* the Psalms of Book I, which seemed to me to 'exhibit any signs of the time when they were composed.' I have subsequently with great care gone through all the Psalms of this Book again; and, in an Appendix to the later editions of Part II, I have made some additional remarks upon Psalms xvii,xxxv,xxxvi,xl. And I now

---

* It will be seen by any one, who has followed my reasoning with any attention, that Mr. PEROWNE has greatly mistaken and misstated my theory, as is shown also below.—*Ed.*

deliberately reassert my belief, that there is not one of the Psalms of this Book, which can be shown, from the internal evidence of its contents, to be older than Ps.lxviii. If Mr. PEROWNE will produce such a Jehovistic Psalm,—I say not out of Book I, but out of any one of the Five Books,—and will point out the *decisive evidence* of its greater antiquity, I shall gladly consider his reasoning, and modify, if necessary, my own present judgment accordingly.

(6) This general assertion, that all critics 'regard the Psalms of Book I as *the earliest in the collection*,' is obviously capable of different meanings. What it would *seem* to say—and what it should mean, to support Mr. PEROWNE's argument, —is, that 'all critics' of any note regard *all* the Psalms of Book I as older than *any others* in the whole collection. Yet Mr. PEROWNE cannot possibly mean this, since he himself says of xxii, on *p.*99, that although, 'according to the inscription this is one of David's Psalms,' yet 'we know of no circumstances in his life to which it can possibly be referred,' and 'the most probable view of it is, that it was composed by one of the exiles *during the Babylonish Captivity*!' He says also of xxv and xxxiv, on *p.*117, that they 'probably both belong to *the later period of the history*—perhaps, *to the time of the exile*'; as to xxviii, he observes, *p.*128, 'HITZIG thinks that *Jeremiah*, and EWALD suggests that *Josiah*, may have been the author of the Psalm'; and so as to xxxi, he writes, *p.*139, 'On the whole it reminds us more of some parts of Jeremiah than of any other of the O.T. writings . . . Hence EWALD and HITZIG have concluded that the Psalm was *written by Jeremiah*'; and again as to xl he says, *p.*183, 'EWALD thinks that the prominence given to the 'roll of the book,' in *v.*7, is an indication that it was written *about the time of Josiah's Reformation*.' Thus *six*, at least, of the Psalms of Book I are ascribed by eminent critics to a *very late* date, and three by Mr. PEROWNE himself to *a time after the Captivity*: and he must be well aware that many other Psalms of Book I are assigned by HUPFELD, EWALD, HITZIG, or OLSHAUSEN, to similar late dates. At any rate, the reader will see that the mere fact of a Psalm being found in Book I does not in any way prove that it is older in date than those of Book II.

9. Mr. PEROWNE's general statement, however, must be reduced to this, that there are *some* Psalms of Book I which are regarded by [? *all* or *some*] critics as 'the earliest in the collection.' If he would point out one such a Psalm, and state the decisive evidence which it affords of its own extreme antiquity, I should gladly, as I have said, examine with all due care that evidence, and admit, if convinced by it, that I am mistaken. But Mr. PEROWNE's statement will be reduced to still smaller dimensions when the reader considers the following series of remarks *made by himself* upon the Psalms of Book I.

Ps.i, 'There is not much in the Psalm itself which helps us to assign it to any particular period of history,' *p.*2;

Ps.ii might be ascribed to the time of David, or Solomon, or Ahaz, *perhaps* to David, *p.*5;

Ps.iii, '*according to the Title*, was composed by David, when he fled from his son Absalom; and *there is nothing in the language of the Psalm to contradict this*. True, there is no allusion to Absalom, &c.,' *p.*11;

Ps.iv 'may probably be assigned to the same author as Ps.iii,' *p.*11;

Ps.v, 'David (*if the Psalm be his*), &c.,' *p.*17;

Ps.vi 'is said to be a Psalm of David, and there is no reason to question it, although at the same time *there is nothing in it to guide us*, &c.,' *p.*21;

Ps.vii, 'there is no reason to doubt that David was (*as stated in the superscription*) the author of the Psalm,' *p.*24;

Ps.viii, 'a Psalm of David—written by him, perhaps, when yet a youth . . . or *if composed in later years*, &c.,' *p.*28;

Ps.ix 'has been regarded by many as a song of victory, composed, *perhaps*, by David, &c.,' *p.*32;

Ps.x, 'it is impossible to say to what period of Jewish history the Psalm is to be referred,' *p.*37:

Ps.xi 'is so short and so general that it is not easy to see to what circumstances in David's life it should be referred,' *p.*44;

Ps.xii 'may be one of David's Psalms: but there is nothing in the circumstances, so far as we know them, of his history, which can lead us to associate the Psalm with any particular event,' *p.*47;

Ps.xiii, 'In this Psalm we see a servant of God, &c.,' (no date assigned), *p.*50;

Ps.xiv, 'There is nothing in the Psalm which can lead us to fix its date or authorship precisely,' *p.*53;

Ps.xv 'is supposed to have been written on the occasion of the removal of the Ark to Zion . . . On the other hand, the name 'holy mountain,' *v.*1, as applied to Zion, would rather suggest a *later* date,' *p.*57;

Ps.xvi is merely *assumed* to be David's without a word of proof, *p.*60;

Ps.xvii 'may be, *as the inscription states*, a Psalm of David, and if so, &c.,' *p.*69;

Ps.xix is again *assumed* to be David's without proof of any kind, *p.*86;

Ps.xx, 'Some would refer this Psalm to the time of David's war with the Syrians and Ammonites; but obviously it would apply to other circumstances equally well,' *p.*92;

Ps.xxi, no date assigned, *p.*95;

Ps.xxii, 'the correct view is probably that this Psalm was composed by one of the exiles *during the Babylonish Captivity*,' *p.*99;

Ps.xxiii was 'most probably written [by David] in *advanced years*';

Ps.xxv was 'perhaps, *written after the exile*,' *p.*117;

Ps.xxvi 'furnishes no direct evidence as to its date,' *p.*121;

Ps.xxvii, 'like the last and the one which follow, may very probably be referred to the time of Absalom's rebellion,' *p.*124;

Ps.xxviii,—'Hitzig thinks that Jeremiah, and Ewald suggests that Josiah, may have been the author of the Psalm. But these are guesses which have little to recommend them; and there is no valid reason why we should reject the *traditional* Title which gives the Psalm to David,' *p.*128;

Ps.xxix, nothing said about the date, *p.*132;

Ps.xxx,—'perhaps, *if the inscription is trustworthy*, it refers to the house which David built, &c.,' *p.*135;

Ps.xxxi 'reminds us more of some parts of Jeremiah than of any other of the

O.T. writings . . . Hence EWALD and HITZIG have concluded that the Psalm was written by Jeremiah,' *p.*139;

Ps.xxxii is *assumed* to be David's without proof of any kind, *p.*144;

Ps.xxxiii—'even tradition is silent as to the authorship and the occasion for which it was composed,' *p.*149;

Ps.xxxiv was, 'perhaps, *written after the exile*,' *p.*117;

Ps.xxxv, 'if it be, as the inscription tells us, a Psalm of David, &c. . . . I confess, however, that the Psalm does not seem to me to be David's,' *p.*155;

Ps.xxxvi 'is not so distinct in its features that we can assign it to any particular occasion in the life of David, or *associate it with any definite period of Jewish history*,' *p.*163;

Ps.xxxvii—nothing said about the date: [being an alphabetical Psalm, it would probably have been, like Ps.xxv and xxxiv, '*perhaps written after the exile*,' *p.*117;]

Ps.xxxviii—nothing said about the date, *p.*173;

Ps.xxxix—nothing said about the date, *p.*101;

Ps.xl—'Whether David was the author of this Psalm we can hardly hope now to decide. . . . We cannot pretend to point to any circumstance in his life to which it undoubtedly refers. EWALD thinks . . . that it was written about the time of Josiah's Reformation,' *p.*183;

Ps.xli—nothing said about the date, *p.*190.

In fact, out of the *forty-one* Psalms of Book I there are only *two*, xviii,xxiv, as to whose date Mr. PEROWNE pronounces at all definitely; while, with respect to the *thirty-nine* others, in the case of *thirteen* he is either altogether *silent*, *three* he assigns to a date after the Captivity, and most of the rest he assumes to be of David's age, merely because of their *Titles*, though of these Titles he says, *p.*cxi,—

'They are not of any necessary authority, and their value must be weighed and tested by the usual critical processes.'

And so Bishop BROWNE says of some of these Titles, *Elohistic Psalms*, *p.*64,—

'These superscriptions are, probably, of *no authority whatever*.'

10. After the above, I confess, I am at a loss to understand what Mr. PEROWNE means to imply, by saying that I have 'scarcely noticed' the Psalms of this Book. What more has he said about them—that is, about the age of their composition—than I myself have said? For I have written as follows in Part II:—

Ps.ii 'is not ascribed to David by any Title, but is generally attributed to him. . . . It is very possible that in the last years of David's life, &c.,' *p.*327;

Ps.iii—HENGSTENBERG and LUTHER agree that this Psalm 'must have been written at a later date' than David's flight from Absalom, *p.*324;

Ps.vii—'there is nothing in this Psalm to decide the question,' as to its date, *p.*324;

Ps.xiv—'these changes may have been made by David himself: but if so, &c.,' *p.*327;

Ps.xvii 'may be David's, as the Title implies,' *p.*396;

Ps.xviii, 'if written by David at all, was written at the close of his life, as HENGSTENBERG says,' *p.*325;

Ps.xx and Ps.xxi 'appear to have been composed *for* David by one of the devout persons of that time,' *p.*317;

Ps.xxx, 'according to HENGSTENBERG, was written in the sixty-eighth year of David's life,' *p.*325;

Ps.xxxv 'is ascribed to David, and may have been written by him at the time of Absalom's rebellion,' *p.*396;

Ps.xxxvi 'may have been written by David, according to the Title,' *p.*396

Ps.xxxviii 'is ascribed to David, and if written by him, &c.,' *p.*327;

Ps.xl—'it is *possible* that David, in the latter days of his life, &c.,' *p.*327;

Ps.xli, 'if written by David, must have been written at the time when he fled from Absalom,' *p.*327.

11. The result of my own examination, however, was stated by me in (II.448) as follows:—

'There is not a single Jehovistic Psalm, which there is any reasonable ground for assigning to the *earlier* part of David's life. Even admitting many Jehovistic Psalms to be David's on the uncertain warrant of their Titles only, yet all of these *may* be assigned, and some of them *must* be assigned, to the latter part of his reign, at the time of, or after, the rebellion of Absalom.'

Is it not plain that Mr. PEROWNE's own statements above-quoted confirm in the most decisive manner the above conclusion, with respect to all the Psalms of Book I, except *two*, xviii and xxiv? Yet the first of these two is ascribed by him (in accordance with my own statement) to the *latter* part of David's reign, since he writes about it as follows, *p.*75:—

'The inscription, which informs us that this hymn was composed *towards the close of David's life*, is confirmed by the fact, &c.'

Thus there remains to be considered only one solitary exception to the correctness of my own statement, even on Mr. PEROWNE's own showing, *viz.* Ps.xxiv, which, Mr. PEROWNE says, *p.*113—

'Was in all probability composed and sung on the occasion of the removal of the Ark from the house of Obed-Edom to the city of David in Mount Zion.'

12. Let me first say that there is nothing in my view as to the later introduction of the name 'Jehovah,' that would prevent my adopting the above conclusion of Mr. PEROWNE himself with respect to this Psalm. In Ps.lxviii, which (as I believe) was really written for this very occasion, 'Jehovah' is used *four* times. It is quite conceivable, therefore, that *some* Psalmist of that age might have written, as in this Psalm, 'The earth is Jehovah's,' 'Who shall ascend into the mountain of Jehovah?' 'Who is the King of Glory? Jehovah, strong and mighty, Jehovah, mighty in battle!' But certainly the *same* writer who composed Ps.lxviii (E.31, A.7, J.4,) would hardly have written *at the very same time* the Psalm before us (E.1, J.6). Nor is there anything in the Psalm to fix it to this occasion. The notion of Mr. PEROWNE, *p.*114, that—

'The verses which declare the character of Jehovah's true worshippers ['he that is clean of hands and pure of heart, who hath not lifted up his soul to vanity, neither hath sworn deceitfully,' *v.*4]—*may perhaps have been suggested by the death*

*of Uzzah*!'—might justly, as it seems to me, be called 'extravagant.' But the reference in *v.*9 to the 'gates' and 'everlasting doors' surely indicates the *Temple* rather than the *Tabernacle*—the time of Solomon or afterwards, rather than that of David. Accordingly HUPFELD and De WETTE suggest that it was composed for the occasion of the *Dedication of the Temple*, for which it was in every way suitable; and the former says, II.*p.*56, 'scarcely any other occasion can be seen for it.' So, too, HITZIG, I.*p.*142, and OLSHAUSEN, *p.*131, reject the supposition of this Psalm's having any reference to the Tabernacle.

13. (7) Returning now to Mr. PEROWNE's observations, quoted above in (7), I remark that the first part of this statement (7), if true, supports my view; but I demur altogether to the latter. There are many Jehovistic Psalms, indeed, *ascribed by their Titles* to David, which, *if* really his, *may* have been written in the earlier part of his life. But they may *not* be his at all, and, if his, they *may* have been written towards the close of his life. Not a single Jehovistic Psalm in the whole collection, I repeat, can be produced, as I believe, which clear internal evidence shows to be David's, and to have been written by him in his earlier years, or at an earlier date than Ps.lxviii.

14. (8) As to these three Psalms, xlvi–xlviii, Mr. PEROWNE says, *p.*224,—

'I am *inclined to think* that they all celebrate the same event, the sudden and miraculous destruction of the army of Sennacherib under the walls of Jerusalem. . . . DELITZSCH (following HENGSTENBERG) refers this and the two following Psalms to the victory of Jehoshaphat over the allied forces of the Moabites, Ammonites, and Edomites, recorded in 2Ch.xx.'

And again he writes, *p.*230,—

'I see no reason why this Psalm (xlvii) should *not* have been composed after the defeat of Sennacherib.'

My own view is expressed in (II.382) as follows:—

'xlvi (E.7,J.3),xlvii(E.8,J.2),xlviii(E.8,J.2), appear to have been written upon days of rejoicing for some great victory, such as those that were gained by Joab and David himself over the very formidable confederacy of Syria and Ammon, about which we read in 2S.x. On these occasions, probably, the king went in procession to the Tabernacle on Mount Zion, to return thanks to God. The 'kings assembled,' Ps.xlviii.4, may have been those referred to in 2S.x.6,8,15,16,19. On Joab's return from the first, and David's from the second, of these victories,—when 'all the *kings* that were servants to Hadarezer, saw that they were smitten before Israel, and made peace with Israel, and served them,' *v.*19,—these Psalms may have been written.'

I still adhere to the above view as being quite as probable as that which Mr. PEROWNE is 'inclined' to maintain.

15. OLSHAUSEN writes on xlvi as follows, *p.*205:—

'The state of affairs, lying at the basis of Ps.xlvi, is in general clear. Mighty conflicts, which even threatened Jerusalem with danger, had shaken whole kingdoms: but the Lord has preserved His holy city, and brought the wars to an end. This state of affairs might be explained out of more than one period of Israelitish

history. EWALD thinks of the *deliverance from Sennacherib's invasion*; HITZIG refers to the *defeated invasion of the host of Damascus and Ephraim*, Is.vii, pointing out some points of contact with Isaiah's modes of expression out of that age, which, however, cannot all be admitted . . . *Anything certain about the time which the poet has in view cannot now be determined.*'

Again, as to Ps.xlviii he writes, *p.*208:—

'It is scarcely possible to give a quite satisfactory conclusion as to the immediate occasion of the origin of this Psalm, as indicated in *v.*5–9. We know nothing of any sudden flight of confederated kings, who threatened Jerusalem: especially the account of the attack of the Moabites, Ammonites, and Edomites in Jehoshaphat's time, 2Ch.xx, reads very differently, [and rests solely on the authority of the Chronicler]. Also the expedition of Rezin and Pekah, 2K.xvi.5, Is.vii.1, is not so described as we should expect, if this Psalm referred to it; and just as little will the passage, Is.viii.9, &c., serve to justify this explanation. Many modern interpreters think of the fall of Sennacherib, which only satisfies the case, if we do not connect it too closely with the confederacy of a number of kings, *v.*5, and are able to recognise again in *v.*5–8 the account in 2K.xix.35, &c.'

But, surely, in 2S.x.15–19 we have the very counterpart of the state of things supposed by this Psalm—the imminent danger to Jerusalem and the whole kingdom of David—the confederate kings—and the sudden dissolution of the confederacy.

16. HITZIG, who thinks that 'none of the Psalms of Book II reach so high as the age of David,' fixes the time of Solomon as the *terminus a quo* for these three Psalms, xlvi–xlviii, because of the mention of the 'ships of Tarshish' in xlviii.7—'thou breakest the ships of Tarshish with an east-wind.' But some years before the event in 2S.x we read of the friendly intercourse which David had with 'Hiram king of Tyre,' 2S.v.11: and this would be quite enough to account for such a passing allusion to merchant-ships as this. Compare also G.xlix.13, 'Zebulun shall dwell at the shore of seas—[that is the shore of merchantmen]—and his border unto Zidon'—which we suppose to have been written about this very time, in the second decade of David's reign (210).

17. Mr. PEROWNE adds the following arguments, *p.*224, to show an identity of style in these Psalms with that of Isaiah, and so fix them in connection with the rout of Sennacherib,—in which event, however, OLSHAUSEN, as we have seen, can trace no distinct resemblance to the circumstances which are here referred to:—

(i) *Isaiah* 'had compared the Assyrian army to a mighty river, overflowing its banks, carrying desolation far and wide, &c. The *Psalmist* employs a like image when he compares the enemies of his country to a roaring sea, &c.'

*Ans.* The Psalmist *makes no such comparison*: he speaks only of 'the earth being moved, the hills being carried into the midst of the sea, the waters roaring, the mountains shaking,' in order to describe the *stormy surging* of that time of 'trouble.'

(ii) '*Isaiah* had described the peace and safety of Jerusalem under the emblem of her own gently-flowing stream of Siloam, viii.6. The *Poet* also sings the praises of that stream, whose channels make glad the city of God.'

*Ans.* There *may* be here an allusion to the 'waters of Siloam that flow softly,' Is.viii.6, and to which is compared the peace which God pours into the hearts of His children. But it is by no means certain that there is any such reference here to Siloam, since it was not a 'river' (נָהָר), and, as OLSHAUSEN observes, *p.*205, 'presented nothing at Jerusalem that could be compared' to one, nor had it any 'streams' or 'channels,' being only a small brook. The figure of a 'river' here employed may be therefore only a *general* metaphor. In any case, however, the comparison in Is.viii.6–8 is of a totally different kind from that here employed. *There* we have the mild or feeble rule of the kings of Judah compared to a 'soft-flowing brook,' and the might of Assyria to an 'overflowing river'; whereas *here* we have the deep, quiet streams of the river of God's peace contrasted with the turbulent waves of this troublesome world.

(iii) 'Again, the *Prophet* had assured the House of David that it had a better defence than that of chariots and horses, had laughed to scorn the power of the enemy, saying, 'Associate yourselves, and ye shall be broken to pieces . . . take counsel together, and ye shall come to nought . . . for God is with us' (*Immanu-El*); and had symbolised the promised deliverance by the birth of the child *Immanuel*. And so the ever-recurring thought of the *Psalm* is, 'God is our refuge and defence,' 'God is in the midst of' the Holy City, 'Jehovah (God) of Hosts is WITH US (*immanu*).' The burden alike of Prophecy and of Psalm is 'Immanu-El,' 'God with us.'

*Ans.* The Second Elohist and Jehovist, writing (as we believe) in the very age to which *we* refer this Psalm, use repeatedly the phrase 'Elohim is with (עִם) thee (you, &c.),' 'Jehovah is with thee,' &c. xxi.22, G.xxvi.28, xxviii.20, xxxi.5,42, xlviii.21, and, in fact, were the first, it would seem, to introduce the use of such phrases in the Pentateuch. The expression 'hosts of Jehovah' occurs in E.xii.41; but we have not yet determined in what age this part of Exodus was written.

18. I add finally in the words of Mr. PEROWNE, *p.*229—

'EICHHORN, who connects xlvi and xlviii with the defeat of Sennacherib, considers xlvii to belong to David's time; it alludes, he thinks, to the final subjugation of the Canaanites, when the Jebusites were driven out of their stronghold, and celebrates the bringing-up of the Ark to the city of David. He is of opinion, however, that the Psalm was not written by David, but either by a contemporary, or by a later poet, who transferred himself in imagination into those times.'

As, however, almost all critics are agreed that the three Psalms, xlvi–xlviii, belong to the same age and probably to the same author, if xlvii belongs to David's time, it is probable that xlvi and xlviii also belong to it; and it would seem that the view which I have expressed, *viz.* that these three Psalms may have been written in David's age, (though a few years later than the time assigned by EICHHORN to xlvii,) is quite as tenable as that assumed by Mr. PEROWNE as being unquestionably true.

19. (9) I have treated of the *later* (post-Captivity) Elohistic Psalms of the Third Book in (II.433–436), and have shown that they correspond to the phenomenon which we observe in the post-Captivity Books of Ezra (E.97,J.37) and

Nehemiah (E.74,J.17). But this does not in any way touch our argument as to the *older* Elohistic Psalms of Book II. In *all* the *historical* and *prophetical* writings *before* the Captivity (except the most ancient parts of the Pentateuch) 'Jehovah' is the predominant name. We should expect, therefore, the *Psalms* of that time to be also Jehovistic, unless some reason existed for the contrary. If, therefore, certain Psalms—*e.g.* lx and lxviii—*do belong to David's time*, as we believe, and *are most decidedly Elohistic*, some reason must have existed for this peculiarity. It appears to us that the explanation, which we have given, is a satisfactory account of the matter; and Mr. PEROWNE himself admits that 'no probable explanation of this phenomenon has yet been given.'

In replying to Mr. PEROWNE we have in reality disposed also of the arguments of Bishop BROWNE. But the importance of his position requires that we should now consider them at full length, separately.

20. I. Bishop BROWNE observes, *p.*54—'Almost without exception, the more obscure, rugged, difficult, archaic Psalms are ascribed to David. The simplest and easiest are mostly those in Book V, which are generally acknowledged to be modern. In Book V, however, this is to be noticed. Any one who takes it up and begins to read from Ps.cvii onwards, especially if he has been reading some of the earlier Psalms before, will feel at once that he is swimming in smooth waters; difficulties are trifling, all is polished and simple; some are a little more obscure than others, but on the whole the difficulties are few. But at about Ps.cxxxviii he will find himself in a different atmosphere. The air grows thicker; the waters are more troubled. Why this change? Evidently because from cxxxviii to cxlv the Psalms are David's; the superscription tells him so; but he has felt it at once, without looking at the titles at all.'

*Ans.* Now let any one look for himself at Psalms cxxxviii, cxxxix, cxliii, cxlv, and see whether these Psalms are not as clear and simple as any of the Psalms of the whole collection are. If these Psalms are really David's, then his style was certainly *not* always 'obscure, rugged, difficult, archaic.' But, whether they are his or not, the reader will be able to judge from his own inspection, as well as from the authorities below, how much weight is to be given to a mere assertion of this kind, and how much reason I had to say that Bp. BROWNE's method of treating the subject is in this instance, at all events, 'too superficial.'

21. Let us see, then, what eminent commentators on the Psalms—who do not write at all from my own point of view—have to say about these very Psalms, or, rather, cxxxviii–cxli, cxliii–cxlv, omitting cxlii, which is only a copy—a *later* copy, as I suppose—of the earlier Elohistic Ps.lvii.

(i) OLSHAUSEN refers *every one* of them to the time of the *Maccabees*. I quote some of his remarks.

Ps.cxxxviii—'Various circumstances lead us to conjecture a *late* date,' *p.*474.

Ps.cxxxix—'In any case, several novelties in the phraseology, and the strong Aramaic colouring of the whole section, decide for a *very late* origin (in the *later* Maccabean time),' *p.*476.

Ps.cxl—'In any case, the language, though very different from that in cxxxix, yet is not free from traces of a *late* age of composition,' *p.*481.

Ps.cxli—'This Psalm belongs, as it seems, to a *very late* age,' *p.*484.

Ps.cxliii—'No doubt can be entertained as to the *late* origin of this Psalm,' *p.*491.

Ps.cxlv, an *alphabetical*, and therefore most probably a *later*, Psalm—'as certainly as this Psalm according to its whole tenor belongs to a *late* age, &c.,' *p.*497.

(ii) HITZIG also refers cxl, cxli, cxliii, cxliv, cxlv, to the *times of the Maccabees*.

(iii) HUPFELD decides *against* the Davidic origin of cxxxviii, cxxxix (on account of its 'Chaldaisms and generally corrupted Hebrew,' &c.), cxl (*v.*10–12 contain '*later* words, which occur nowhere else,' IV.*p.*360), cxli, cxliv, and apparently also of cxlii, cxliii; he passes over altogether the age of cxlv.

(iv) EWALD assigns cxl, cxli, cxlii, to the *last times of the kingdom of Judah*; all the others he regards as *post-Exilic*. These are some of his remarks.

Ps.cxxxix—'to judge from the style, we have probably no other Psalms of this writer in the Psalter,' *p.*312.

Ps.cxl–cxlii—'it is difficult to make out the age and the writer more closely; yet the sense of these Psalms seems most appropriate to the times of the reign of Manasseh,' *p.*127, but Ps.cxlii is 'a little later,' *p.*131.

And yet Bishop BROWNE maintains that these Psalms are all David's! and he asserts, *p.*55, with reference to the above statement, among others, 'These, I say, are *facts*!!!'

22. II. Again Bishop BROWNE asserts, *p.*55, as another of these 'facts,' that, out of all the Davidic Psalms, 'those arranged at the beginning of Book I have a *more archaic aspect and flavour* than any others whatsoever. I would refer especially to Psalms vii, ix, x, xii, xvi, xvii. If these are contrasted with such as lxxiv, lxxviii, lxxxii, (Psalms of Asaph in Book IV,) or with the non-Davidic Psalms of Book V, the difference will be felt by every one who has the most superficial knowledge of the original.'

*Ans.* This, again, is very confidently asserted.

Yet, of the six Psalms above quoted, EWALD assigns *two*, ix, x, to the *post-Exilic* time, and *two* others, xvi, xvii, to the *times of the later kings*, to which he also gives lxxxii: further, EWALD particularly notices in xvi, xvii, 'the *soft, flowing* style,' in direct contradiction to Bishop BROWNE'S statement as to their peculiar 'archaic aspect and flavour.'

So HUPFELD decides *against* the *early* origin of ix, x, (which with xi forms an *alphabetical* arrangement—see HUPF.I.*p.*169, HITZ.I.*p.*44,—and this alone indicates a later date for it than the first years of David), and xii, which 'betrays a certain relationship to x, xi, yet not so close and distinct, that we can conclude with certainty that it was written at the same time, and under the same circumstances, and by the same author,' I.*p.*248. As to the other three he determines nothing.

OLSHAUSEN 'conjectures a *late* origin' for vii; he gives ix, x, 'most probably either to the *Babylonian* or *Syro-Macedonian* period,' *p.*56,61,—as to xii, he says, the age cannot be closely defined, only certain phenomena in it 'belong most to

the *later* times of Judaism,' *p.*72, while the expressions of Ps.xvi 'remind us much of *the age of the Maccabees* . . . It is certain, too, that the state of things, which lies at the basis of the Psalm, is better explained by no other time,' *p.*83, and the same is true of Ps.xvii, *p.*90.

Yet 'this, I say, is a *fact*,' says Bishop BROWNE, 'that these Psalms of Book I—I refer especially to vii,ix,x,xii,xvi,xvii—have a more archaic aspect and flavour *than any others whatsoever*.' And this will be felt by '*every one* who has the *most superficial knowledge* of the original.' At all events, it seems that the three great scholars above quoted have plainly not 'felt' it.

23. III. Bishop BROWNE says, *p.*56,—'I am unwilling not to notice, whilst on this subject, a fact which might have seemed to tell for Bishop COLENSO's theory, though he has not, I think, referred to it, but which I am convinced is a very real argument in the opposite direction. It is this. The language of some of the Davidic Psalms is often more obscure, and has a more primitive and rude appearance, than much of the language even of the Pentateuch.' And he explains this by saying that '(i) Poetry is generally more obscure than Prose; (ii) From the time of Moses to that of Samuel civilization had retrograded; when civilization stagnates, language stagnates; when civilization retrogrades, language falls back upon barbarism.'

*Ans.* Ps.lxviii, out of the early part of David's reign, as Bp. BROWNE and Mr. PEROWNE both allow, is certainly, as it seems to me,—in complete accordance with my whole argument,—more rugged and archaic than any of the *poems* in the Pentateuch, except the little primitive songs in N.xxi.14–15,17,18,27–30,—especially than the Song of Moses, D.xxxii.1–43,—and on this account, on Bp. BROWNE's own showing, appears to be *older* than any of these portions of the Pentateuch.

On the traditionary view, however, Bishop BROWNE's argument falls to the ground at once, when attention is directed to the Song of Hannah, 1S.ii.1–10, which, though supposed to have been written in the infancy of Samuel, is very far from being 'rude and archaic,' and is, in fact, a most finished composition. *We*, of course, are at liberty to believe that this passage is only a later Psalm, (as it manifestly is,) which has been put into the mouth of Hannah, though very ill-suited to her circumstances. What meaning, for instance, could the words of *v.*10 have had in *her* mouth—'He shall give strength unto His King, and exalt the horn of His Anointed'?

24. IV. Bishop BROWNE says, *p.*58,—'Do those Psalms, which bear these unequivocal marks of antiquity, use *only* or *chiefly* the name 'Elohim,' while the later Psalms use only or chiefly 'Jehovah'? I answer most distinctly, No! On the contrary, I assert, and am prepared to prove, that, judging by their language and style, the most ancient Psalms are at least as often Jehovistic as Elohistic, and that the *purely Elohistic Psalms* have *in no single instance* [the italics are Bp. BROWNE's] the peculiar marks of antiquity on which I have been laying this stress.'

*Ans.* We shall test presently the value of the first part of this very positive

'assertion.' As to the second part, I cannot suppose that Bp. BROWNE, by using the phrase '*purely* Elohistic Psalms,' meant to exclude one of the most decidedly Elohistic Psalms of the whole Psalter, viz. Ps.lxviii (E.31,A.7,J.4), because it contains 'Jehovah' four times; for then his reasoning would not be candid. Yet this Psalm, at any rate, is reckoned by De WETTE, as 'among the oldest relics of Hebrew Poetry.' HUPF. III.*p.*201.

So, too, HITZIG, though he does not allow that any of the Psalms of Book II are as old as David's age, I.*p.*255, yet says of Ps.xlix, which is 'purely Elohistic,' that its style is 'condensed, cramped, and rough,' and it belongs to the 'time of the old, unbroken Hebraism,' *p.*268.

In fact, inasmuch as Bp. BROWNE finds these 'peculiar marks of antiquity' in Ps.cxxxviii–cxlv—most of which, as we have seen, are ascribed by the four most eminent critics of the day to *very late* times,—it is plainly impossible to place any great confidence in his judgment in respect of the present question. Yet we shall carefully examine all his statements, which might be thought to be of any consequence in this discussion.

25. V. 'Of those which are *ancient* and *strongly Jehovistic*, I would mention *especially*, vii, ix,x,xii,xvi,xvii,xviii,xxxii,xxxiv, xxxv.xxxvi,xxxviii, xxxix, lxxxiv,cxl, cxli,cxlii,cxliv,' *p.*59.

*Ans.* Here, then, are *eighteen* Psalms, which Bishop BROWNE 'mentions *especially*': they may be regarded, therefore, as the *strongest* instances which he is able to produce of *ancient* Jehovistic Psalms. Let us look more closely at the list.

The first *six* of them have been already considered by us (22); and we saw that EWALD assigns *four* of them, HUPFELD *three* at least, OLSHAUSEN *five*, to *very late* dates.

In (21) we saw also that cxl,cxli, were ascribed by *all* of OLSHAUSEN, HITZIG, HUPFELD, EWALD, and cxliv, by the first *three* of these critics, to *very late* dates.

And Ps.cxlii is merely a Jehovistic copy of the (as we suppose, *ancient*) Elohistic Psalm lvii.

Thus, at a stroke, we have pretty well disposed of *ten* of the eighteen.

As to the other eight, *viz.* xviii,xxxii,xxxiv,xxxv,xxxvi,xxxviii,xxxix,lxxxiv,—

EWALD assigns to a *late* date xxxiv,xxxv,xxxvi,xxxviii,xxxix,lxxxiv;

HUPFELD „ „ xviii,xxxiv,lxxxiv;

HITZIG „ „ xxxii,xxxv,xxxvi,xxxviii,xxxix;

OLSHAUSEN „ „ xviii,xxxiv,xxxv,xxxix,lxxxiv.

So that by one or more of these four eminent critics *every one* of these eighteen especially 'ancient' Psalms of Bishop BROWNE is ascribed to a *late* date.

26. I myself have said that xviii, xxxviii, lxxxiv, *may* be Davidic Psalms; as to the rest I have said nothing, as I can trace no signs of time in them whatever. But the reader will see at once, from the judgments of the above distinguished critics, how little dependence can be placed on Bishop BROWNE'S mere assertion,—that these are *ancient* Jehovistic Psalms,—and how impossible it is that they can really exhibit those 'unquestionable notes of great antiquity in their character

and style,' which Bishop BROWNE finds in them—'especially in such as ix, x, xii, xvi, xvii, xxxii,' *p.*59—but which not even one of these scholars has noticed. Nay, out of these very *six*, just named 'especially' as being ancient in style and character, EWALD gives ix, x, to the 'post-Exilic' period, xvi, xvii, to the times of the later kings, and HUPFELD decides *against* the early origin of ix, x, xii. And whereas Bishop BROWNE says, *p.*59, 'Ps.vii *must* have been written before the death of Saul,' 'Ps.xxxiv has the characteristics of an ancient Psalm in its style and diction,' we find that EWALD, HITZIG, and OLSHAUSEN all refer the latter of these two Psalms to a *late* date, as OLSHAUSEN does the former, while LUTHER and others assign it to the latter part of David's life. Others again, as HUPFELD, agree with me in saying that 'there is nothing in the Psalm itself to decide the question.' In fact, it would seem that there is scarcely a single one of Bp. BROWNE's *seventeen* Psalms (not considering cxlii) which contains these 'peculiar marks' so distinctly, as to allow any *two* of these four critics to place it even in the Davidic age. Nay, Mr. PEROWNE himself assigns Ps.xxxiv, one of Bishop BROWNE's 'especially' *ancient* Psalms, an *acrostic* Psalm, 'probably to the later period of the history—perhaps, *to the time of the Exile!*' *p.*117.

27. VI. 'Of those which are *more recent* and *Elohistic*, I refer to xlii, xliv, xlv, l, li, lx, lxii, lxiii, lxxii, lxxiv, lxxviii, lxxix, lxxx, lxxxii, lxxxiii, cxiv,' *p.*59.

*Ans.* Here, again, are *sixteen* Psalms, of which I might readily allow *six*, *viz.* lxxiv, lxxviii, lxxix, lxxx, lxxxii, lxxxiii, to be post-Exilic,—as EWALD, HITZIG, OLSHAUSEN maintain, and as in fact I have allowed lxxiv, lxxix, to be,—since it is admitted that in that age the Elohistic Books of Ezra and Nehemiah were written. But, from examination of the contents, I think it possible that several of these may be of the Davidic age. And so KIMCHI, LUTHER, GROTIUS, MICHAELIS, CALVIN, regard Ps.lxxxiii as Davidic; and, in the case of Ps.lxxviii, the 'orthodox' HENGSTENBERG pronounces the following severe judgment upon such views as those of Bishop BROWNE,—'To deny that this Psalm belongs to the age of David, manifests an utter misunderstanding of its contents,' II.*p.*452, *Eng. Vers.*

28. I repeat, then, it is of no consequence whatever to my argument whether further examination shall lead me, or not, to agree more closely with the particular views of EWALD, &c., with regard to these six Psalms of Book III. But there are now left *ten* for consideration; and we might expect that here, at least, we should find Bishop BROWNE making his very confident assertions on unquestionable grounds. Yet of these ten Psalms, which Bishop BROWNE declares to be *recent* Elohistic Psalms, Mr. PEROWNE assigns *two*, li, lxiii, to the Davidic age,—as to lx he says, 'It is not *certain* that the Psalm belongs to David,'—two more, xlv and lxxii, he assigns to Solomon's reign—possibly, the *beginning* of it—whereas I give them to the latter part of David's,—in the case of *four* others, xlii, xliv, l, lxii, he does not attempt to settle the date,—and as to cxiv he does not express himself in Vol. I of his work, the only volume as yet published. Thus, it will be seen that even Mr. PEROWNE does not assign any *single one* of Bishop BROWNE's nine 'more recent' Elohistic Psalms of Book II, to a later date than the time of Solomon, and two of them at least he gives to the age of David.

But the looseness of Bishop BROWNE's statements and reasonings is best shown by the fact that, whereas on *p.*59 he reckons Ps.lx as '*more recent* and Elohistic,' yet on *p.*61 he himself argues as if this Psalm were rightly assigned by its Title (in accordance with my view) to the fifteenth year of David's reign, and he admits also the probable or possible Davidic origin of Ps.li, lxii, lxiii, lxxii, only assigning them to a *late* part of David's life,—to which I make no objection whatever, as far as my view is concerned, though, perhaps, I should not in all cases assent to his arguments.

I may add that EWALD and others regard xliv, lx, lxxii, cxiv, as *post-Exilic* Psalms, which my view would readily allow.

29. VII. 'Ps.xliv is not ascribed to David: it is impossible to find any period of David's reign, or any events in it, to which its language would be applicable. Though Bishop COLENSO would gladly place it as early as possible, *he only asks the question*, '*May not the Psalm have been written in David's time?*' If it were written by David, of which there is neither proof nor trace, it must have been written when David was king, and when, as king, he had suffered from severe affliction and defeat; that is to say, it must have been, at the earliest, *very late* in David's reign; for there were no such sufferings early in that reign.' *p.*60.

*Ans.* I really cannot understand how Bishop BROWNE could have allowed himself to write the words which I have above italicised. It is true, I have not committed myself to bold untenable assertions in respect of the dates of Psalms which I knew to be uncertain. And, in deference to the judgment of eminent critics, HUPFELD, EWALD, and others, I put my suggestion in the form of a question. But I went on to discuss the matter at full length in (II.370–372), and showed most distinctly what my own conviction was, observing 'If this view be correct, this Psalm also must have been composed by David *in the early part of his reign*.'

30. But Bishop BROWNE's language is the more surprising, because I had quoted in full the opinion of HENGSTENBERG, who points out clearly the very occasion to which the words of the Psalm seem exactly to refer, *viz.* the time when David, 'as king, had suffered from severe affliction and defeat,' in the *early* part of his reign, at the hand of the Edomites, and when Joab 'went up to bury the slain,' 1K.xi.16,—that is, the slain of *Israel*, left dead upon the field or smitten in their flight, for, of course, he did not go up to bury the slain of *Edom*. Bishop BROWNE, it would seem, has entirely overlooked this fact in David's history.

31. VIII. 'Ps.xlv . . . . is generally thought to have been written when Solomon was married to Pharaoh's daughter. Bishop COLENSO would assign it to the wedding of Solomon to Naamah,* the mother of Rehoboam, which must have taken place during David's lifetime: but even this computation would place it at

---

* This view derives strong support from the fact, that in the LXX, 1K.xii.24, Naamah is actually said to have been '*the daughter of Hanun, son of Nahash, king of the children of Ammon*,' by which circumstance all the allusions in the Psalm, as I have shown in (II.376), are fully explained.

the very end of David's life. By that time it is admitted that Jehovism had not only become prevalent but universal, and yet the name Jehovah never occurs here.' *p.*60.

*Ans.* It is *not* admitted that, towards the end of David's reign, the use of Jehovah was *universally* prevalent to such an extent, that 'Elohim' might not still be used, and used exclusively, by some pious poet, three times together, as it is in this Psalm. On the contrary, we have had instances of the Jehovistic writer of Genesis, in this very age, employing 'Elohim' exclusively, as in G.xxxiii.5,10,11. In fact, it may rather be questioned, as I have said (II.442), whether *any* thoroughly *Jehovistic* Psalms were written in the age of David.

32. IX. Bishop BROWNE's remarks, on *p.*62, upon the 'Psalms of Asaph' in Book III, are altogether beside the mark—except that of endeavouring to raise prejudice to serve instead of argument, by speaking of David's having 'written just after he had learned the *fable* of the Exodus from its *forger* Samuel,'—words which I indignantly reject as Bishop BROWNE's, not my own. If he can prove *all* these Psalms to be post-Exilic, as I have shown *some* of them to be, I am quite content. And as to Ps.lxxviii, I must leave him to settle the matter with the orthodox HENGSTENBERG, only contrasting their two judgments; 'There is, therefore, *nothing* really to assign this Psalm to David, and *everything* to prove that it is *late*,' BROWNE, *p.*62; '*To deny that this Psalm belongs to the age of David*, manifests an utter misunderstanding of its contents,' HENGST.II.*p.*452.

When, however, he observes, *p.*63, 'Ps.lxxxiii is referred by KIMCHI, VENEMA, and others, to the wars of the Ammonites, &c. against Jehoshaphat: and Bishop COLENSO seems to think this probable: Elohim occurs four times, Jehovah twice,'—I must say that I have not recognised as *probable* any such view as the above. On the contrary, while admitting, as I was bound to do, that such a view was *possible*, I have given reasons for believing that the Psalm belongs to the Davidic age, II. *p.*319, in accordance with the views of LUTHER, MICHAELIS, and GROTIUS.

33. X. 'Here I would call attention to the fact that, whilst Bishop COLENSO has examined at length Books II, III, V, of the Psalter, he has taken scarcely any notice of Book I. Yet in many respects Book I is the most instructive of all. It is true the superscriptions but seldom assign the date. But the whole Book is Davidic: all but three of the Psalms in it are ascribed to David: all have the character of David's writing. Moreover, none of the Five Books has so generally and so markedly an archaic style and diction; and the very fact of its standing the first of the five makes it probable that it was esteemed the oldest. Now, if we look at Bishop COLENSO's own Tables, we shall find that in this, to all appearance, the most ancient part of the whole Psalter, Jehovah occurs four times to Elohim once.' *p.*63.

*Ans.* Here, again, all is bold and general assertion. Bishop BROWNE can write thus sweepingly and confidently from a superficial view of the matter. I venture to say that he could *not* have done so, if he had studied, one by one,

minutely and carefully, the whole Book of Psalms, as I think he was bound to have done, before entering the lists in this manner against me. What are the facts of the case? Mr. PEROWNE, who *has* thoroughly studied the Psalms of Books I and II, who writes from a point of view by no means friendly to myself, and who repeats Bishop BROWNE's statement as to my having 'taken scarcely any notice of Book I,' yet himself (as we have seen) pronounces definitely as to the early date of *two only* of the *forty-one* Psalms of Book I; while with respect to the *thirty-nine* others, he either merely assumes them to be Davidic because of the Titles, or is altogether silent as to their age, or assigns them to a time below the Captivity.

34. As to the 'markedly archaic style and diction' which, according to Bishop BROWNE, characterise *all* the Psalms of this Book—'the *whole* Book is Davidic—all but three of the Psalms in it are ascribed to David—*all* have the character of David's writing,'—the reader will be able to judge for himself by this time how far Bishop BROWNE's judgment as to style and diction can be relied on. Surely, if these characteristics were so distinctly marked, we should not find EWALD assigning *four* of them, ix, x, xxxiii, xxxvii, to a time after the Captivity,—(and among these are *two*, ix, x, which Bishop BROWNE twice quotes especially, as 'exhibiting peculiar marks—unquestionable notes—of high antiquity')—and *twenty-three* more to the times *after* David, most of them to the times of later kings—including again *eight*, xii, xvi, xvii, xxxiv, xxxv, xxxvi, xxxviii, xxxix, of Bishop BROWNE's 'especially' ancient and archaic Psalms.

35. The insinuation, therefore, that I have purposely passed by the Psalms of Book I in my examination of the Psalter, because it would not have suited my purpose to consider them too closely, is quite unfounded, and unworthy of either Bishop BROWNE or Mr. PEROWNE. I *have* considered them, in (II.444), as fully as the other Books, and have said all that I thought it necessary to say about them. And I have allowed, as it perfectly consists with my views to allow, that *some* of the Psalms of this Book *may* be Davidic, 'ancient, archaic'; though I do not see one, which I feel compelled to place at an earlier age than Ps.lxviii or Ps.lx. If Bishop BROWNE would *produce clear and decisive evidence to show that there are undoubtedly such older Psalms*, this would be more to the purpose than indulging in rash and sweeping assertions, and unfair insinuations.

36. As to the notion that Book I, *because it stands first*, must necessarily be regarded as containing the *oldest* Psalms,—for *this* is what Bp. BROWNE must mean for the purposes of his argument, by saying that it is 'to all appearance the *most ancient part* of the Psalter,' since it would make nothing for his view to say that it is merely *the first set of Psalms that was collected*—it falls to the ground at once, if the view of Mr. PEROWNE, as well as of EWALD and others, be true that Book I contains some Psalms written *after the Exile*.

37. XI. Bp. BROWNE, after having devoted many pages to the above discussions, at last comes to 'consider particularly those single Psalms, on which the Bishop lays most stress,' and proceeds as follows, *p.*64 :—

'Let us observe, first, that he takes Psalms lii,liv,lvi,lvii,lix,lxiii, all in Book II, and tells us that by their Titles they belong to the early age of David, whilst in their diction they are exclusively or predominantly Elohistic. Ps.lxiii, I have already proved, could not have belonged to David's early life. Of the other five it is unnecessary to say more than this. They may have been composed at the times mentioned in the superscriptions; though these superscriptions are probably of no authority whatever. They do not, however, bear any of *the peculiar marks of great antiquity*. Ps. lii,liv, are very short: none of them are very long: and the predominance of one name of God over another in a short Psalm may easily have been accidental. But, even supposing all the points to be proved,—*viz.* that they are David's Psalms, written early in his life, and Elohistic in diction,—still they are only some, and those not the most unquestioned, of his early productions. We have already seen that others, more markedly and unquestionably belonging to that early period, if not altogether prior to it, are as decidedly Jehovistic as these are Elohistic.'

38. Bp. BROWNE has again misstated my argument. I have *not* '*taken* Ps. lii,liv, &c.,' and appealed to them as ancient and Elohistic. On the contrary, I have refused to build any argument upon these Psalms, and have said, (II.422)—

'We have now examined all the Psalms of Book II, and have found that, while we can say very confidently of *some* of them, as Ps.li,lx,lxviii, that they were written by David about the middle of his life, there is reason to believe that *all* of them *may have been* written in David's time—some, as the Titles imply, in the *earlier*, some in the *middle*, and some in the *later* years of it. With respect to the above *three* Psalms, however, li,lx,lxviii, it seems almost certain that they *were* written by David, &c.' And I have continually appealed to these *three* Psalms, and to these alone (II.448,449,493.xiii). I am at a loss to understand how Bp. BROWNE could have so incorrectly stated my views.

39. We may pass over the remark as to the 'peculiar marks of great antiquity,' the value of which we have learned by this time to estimate. But Bishop BROWNE himself admits, *p.*61,64, that Ps.li(E.6,J.0),lx(E.5,J.0),lxii(E.7,J.0),lxiii(E.3,J.0), lxviii(E.31,A.7,J.4), *are* Davidic Psalms: and this is quite sufficient for my purpose. I argue that the phenomena here observed show that *with some pious writer or writers in David's reign the name Jehovah was not in common use*,—as it *must* have been—at least, with pious men—in that age, *if* the narratives in the Pentateuch, and the Historical Books generally,—*e.g.* comp.1S.ii.1-10,—are historically true. I say, further, that these phenomena, which seem otherwise (as Mr. PEROWNE allows) inexplicable, may be fully explained by the view, (which is based, however, upon other entirely independent arguments,) that these narratives are not to be regarded as in all their details historically true, and that in particular the Name 'Jehovah' was, in David's time, of comparatively recent introduction into the worship of Israel. But, if *these* five Elohistic Psalms really *are* (as Bishop BROWNE admits) of Davidic origin, I go on to observe that it is *à priori* not unlikely that *other* Psalms of Book II *may* be of the same age—perhaps, even *all* of them. And, in fact, upon examination, I cannot find one, that *may not* in

my judgment be ascribed to that age; while Mr. PEROWNE assigns *ten* to it, and leaves *ten* others with their ages undetermined.

40. As to Bishop BROWNE's statement that '*we have seen* that other Psalms, more markedly and unquestionably belonging to that early period, if not altogether prior to it, are as decidedly Jehovistic, as these are Elohistic,' it is unfortunate that out of the *six*, which he quotes repeatedly as 'especially' deserving of notice on account of their exhibiting peculiar and unquestionable marks of high antiquity,—*viz.* ix,x,xii,xvi,xvii,xxxii, HUPFELD, as we have seen, decides *against* the Davidic origin of *three* of them, ix,x,xii, EWALD gives *two*, xvi,xvii, to the times of the later kings, and *two*, xvi,xvii, to the *post-Exilic* period, and OLSHAUSEN assigns a *late* origin to ix,x,xii,xvi,xvii, as HITZIG does to xxxii.

41. XII. I had thought, however, that Bishop BROWNE was at last going to grapple fairly with the real point of my argument, and to 'consider particularly those single Psalms on which the Bishop lays most stress,' *viz.* li,lx,lxviii. As to li and lx, having quietly admitted already on *p.*60,61, all that I have maintained in respect of them, he says not a word more: and he disposes very briefly of Ps.lxviii. However, he admits this also to be Davidic, and says, *p.*61,—

By no possibility could the Psalm have been composed before the events mentioned in 2S.vi,'—and these are precisely the events to which I *have* referred it.

42. Bishop BROWNE then proceeds,—

'But, if so, it was by no means one of his *earliest* poems; whereas we find several emphatically Jehovistic Psalms, which both from their *Titles*, and by their contents and style, we cannot doubt (?) to assign to David's early youth.'

It is disappointing to find that Bishop BROWNE has not just here, when the occasion so expressly required it, pointed out one or more of the Jehovistic Psalms, to which he refers. As to those which he has quoted (25), as being 'especially' characterised by 'unquestionable marks of high antiquity,' I may be allowed, with the judgments of so many eminent critics before me,—and even with Mr. PEROWNE assigning one of them, xxxiv, 'perhaps to the time of the exile,'—to entertain for the present some reasonable 'doubt.'

43. XIII. Bishop BROWNE then gives a table of *twenty* Psalms, of which the first five are, in his view, *unquestionably ancient*, but *Jehovistic*, *viz.* vii, xxvii, xxxiv(!), cxlii,xxiv, and the others all *Elohistic*,—nine of different dates in David's life, lxviii, lx,lxi,lxii,li,cviii,lxiii,xlv,lxxii,—and six 'Psalms of Asaph,' lxxiv,lxxvii,lxxviii, lxxix,lxxxii,lxxxiii, all supposed to be of very late date, except lxxxiii, which Bishop BROWNE assigns to the time of Jehoshaphat, and supposes that I admit this, a mistake which I have already corrected. The object of this Table is, of course, to show that there is an utter confusion in the use of the Divine Names,—that no argument whatever can be derived from it,—or rather, in Bishop BROWNE's words, *p.*66—'if we take these Psalms only,—(and the evidence for their dates is far better than the evidence for the dates of many, on which Bishop COLENSO relies so confidently,—) we shall absolutely reverse the COLENSO theory, and pronounce

'Jehovah' to occur more frequently in the earlier, 'Elohim' most frequently in the more modern, Psalms.'

44. I have already said repeatedly that the fact that 'Psalms of Asaph' are found in Book III, such as the six above quoted, which may be shown to be *very late*, and yet are *Elohistic*, does not present the least difficulty in respect of my theory, since we observe the same phenomenon in the late-written Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. But I do not believe that *all* the Psalms of Asaph *are* of this late date; and as to Ps.lxxxiii, in particular, I assign it, with MICHAELIS, LUTHER, and GROTIUS, to the time of David.

Also, the nine Davidic-Elohistic Psalms, stretching over the whole of his reign, present no difficulty whatever in respect of my view, *viz.* that the name Jehovah had been but recently introduced in Samuel's days, and was making progress more and more throughout the reigns of Saul and David, yet so that some pious writers of that age may have begun to use it in their compositions sooner or more freely than others.

45. The only real difficulty in the way of my theory might arise from the discovery that there are undoubtedly *Jehovistic* Psalms of an *earlier* date than Ps.lxviii, —betraying 'unquestionable marks of that high antiquity'—so that they must be assigned to that age. Yet, even then, if Samuel wrote Psalms for the young Prophets of his School, he would, doubtless, have introduced the name 'Jehovah' in them, and other younger men might have followed their master's example. It would not, therefore, be a fatal blow to my theory, if even such *early Jehovistic Psalms* could be found, *unless* it could be shown, by internal evidence of style, &c., that they were due to some author, who had *afterwards* himself written *Elohistic* Psalms.

46. But I deny altogether that the *five* Psalms selected by Bp. BROWNE, as undoubtedly *early* Jehovistic Psalms, have certainly the character which he assigns to them. One of them, indeed, is the acrostical Ps.xxxiv, which even HENGSTENBERG regards as written in a late period of David's life, but which Mr. PEROWNE assigns 'to *the time of the Exile.*' Another is cxlii, which HENGSTENBERG also admits, III.*p.*517, *Eng. Ed.*, to have been composed at a *later* part of David's life, but which EWALD assigns to a late period in the history of the kings, and OLSHAUSEN to a late age. A third is xxvii, written, says EWALD, *p.*67, 'when the Temple of Solomon had long been standing,' and which even Mr. PEROWNE gives to an advanced period in David's life, during Absalom's rebellion, *p.*124,—instead of its 'style of composition pointing to the early days of David, when he was flying from Saul,' as Bp. BROWNE says. The fourth is vii, which OLSHAUSEN refers to a late date, and LUTHER and others to the latter part of David's life; whereas I prefer to say with HUPFELD that 'there is nothing in the Psalm itself to decide the question.' And the fifth is xxiv, which HUPFELD and DE WETTE, HITZIG, and OLSHAUSEN, all assign to a later date than the days of David's Tabernacle.

47. Thus Bp. BROWNE'S Table falls to the ground. It *may* be true, as he asserts, *p.*66, that 'Elohism is not a mark of antiquity, Jehovism is not a note of novelty': but he has not in any way *proved* this. It *is* true, certainly, as he says, that 'many of the most *modern* Psalms—*i.e.* some of the Psalms of Asaph in

Book III—are exclusively Elohistic.' I admit this fully: it does not in the least affect my argument. But he has altogether failed at present to prove that 'many of the *most ancient* Psalms are eminently Jehovistic.' The Psalms, which he *has* selected, as especially betraying the most manifest signs of ancient date, are in many cases assigned by the most eminent critics of the day—one of them even by Mr. PEROWNE—to a very low age; so that, whether *their* view as to the date of these Psalms be right or wrong, they were not at all events so keenly sensible of the odour of antiquity breathing from these Psalms as Bp. BROWNE appears to be.

48. XIV. Bp. BROWNE concludes his observations on the Psalms, of which I have extracted every single notice which seemed to be of any importance in the present argument, by writing as follows, *p.*66 :—

'We may thank Bp. COLENSO for *having rested his case so largely on the testimony of the Psalmists.*'

I protest emphatically against this unfair and unwarranted statement.

In this way the reader's attention is turned away from the real point at issue, to a collateral question of altogether secondary importance. *I have never rested my case on the testimony of the Psalmists.* My main arguments, to prove the unhistorical character of large portions of the Pentateuch, and the composite authorship of the Books of Moses and Joshua, rest on perfectly independent grounds. I have distinctly stated (II.493.xiii), that I regard these facts about the Psalms as only *confirming* the view, to which I had been led by an entirely different process of reasoning—that, 'so far from being in any way *at variance* with the conclusion, to which we had already come on other clear grounds, they are on the contrary quite *in accordance* with it.' II.451.

49. If my views are correct, as to *some* of the Elohistic Psalms of Book II being Davidic, and being also among the oldest in the Psalter,—as to which point I am supported by the judgment of DE WETTE with regard to Ps.lxviii,—then we have evidence of the fact that the name 'Jehovah' was not freely and familiarly used by the pious writer or writers of those particular Psalms. And therefore, as it seems to me, we have a strong independent corroboration of the result, to which we have been led by the examination of the Pentateuch itself, that the Name Jehovah had only been recently introduced, as the Name of the Covenant-God of Israel, into their common worship and conversation, at the time when these Psalms were composed.

50. The corroboration thus afforded would, no doubt, be greatly strengthened, if it should be admitted (i) that *most* or *all* of the Psalms of Book II, all being Elohistic, may possibly, or even probably, be also of the Davidic age, and (ii) that no *Jehovistic* Psalms can be assigned with any confidence to the early part of David's life, or to the age before it. But the corroborative force of this evidence would not be by any means destroyed, even if these *two* points should not be admitted. (i) If it could be shown that there are undoubtedly *Jehovistic* Psalms in the collection older than Ps.lxviii, that would be quite consistent with our view. From the time when Samuel, as we believe, laboured to invest with a high and holy character this Sacred Name—

*i.e.* we may suppose, from the time when he judged the people, and taught them to put away their Baalim and Ashtaroth, and serve Jehovah only, 1S.vii.3–17, and regard 'Jehovah their Elohim' as their King, xii.12,—*half a century* before the time when Ps.lxviii was written,—either Samuel himself, or some one or other of his disciples, may very probably have written Psalms in which they used the Name Jehovah, even as Ps.lxviii itself contains the Name *four* times. (ii) If, again, it could be shown that there are undoubtedly *Elohistic* Psalms written as late as the last days of David or the first of Solomon, that also would be consistent with our view—since one writer might very probably retain the use of 'Elohim,' as the usual name for the Deity, to a later day than another.

51. As it is, I cannot admit that Bp. BROWNE has done anything to show the truth even of either of these two points; though, if proved, they would not by any means destroy the force of our argument, derived from the mere fact of the existence of such Psalms as lx,lxviii, and others in the Psalter, which are admitted to be Davidic, yet either contain 'Jehovah' not at all, or else so rarely, in comparison with 'Elohim,' as to show clearly a decided preference for the latter. Let it be noted also that the very use of 'Jehovah,' occasionally, makes it impossible to assume that this Name was freely used in the *original* copies, but changed to 'Elohim' by some later Editor. If he had changed the name thus in one place, he would surely have changed it everywhere, and not left it *twice* in xlvii,xlviii,lv,lxx, *thrice* in xlvi,lix, lxxi, *four* times in lxviii, *five* times in lxix.

52. It is plain, then, that the writer of Ps.lxviii *did* prefer the use of 'Elohim.'*

---

* I have argued in (II.407,408) that the formula in N.x.35, said to have been used at every movement of the Ark in the wilderness, is most probably of later origin than Ps.lxviii.1, with which it is almost identical in expression, and is, in fact, copied from it—the words having been first used in the Psalm, on the occasion of bringing-up the Ark to Mount Zion in David's time, and in a later age adapted by the writer of the passage in Numbers, to the movements of the Ark in the wilderness, with a change of the Divine Name from the original form, 'Elohim,' as it appears in the Psalm, to 'Jehovah,' which had now become more freely used in Israel.

A strong confirmation of the above view seems to be given by the following fact.

In N.x.33, we have the expression, 'Ark of the Covenant of Jehovah,' a phrase which is used repeatedly by the *Deuteronomist*, x.8,xxxi.9,25,26,Jo.iii.3,17,iv.7,18, vi.8,viii.33, *comp.* also 'Ark of the Covenant,' Jo.iii.6,6,8,11,14,iv.9,vi.6,—'Ark of Jehovah,' Jo.iii,13, iv.5,11, vi.11,12, vii.6,—*all*, most probably, Deuteronomistic passages; and not one of these formulæ occurs anywhere else in the Pentateuch, except the first of them in N.xiv.44. But N.xiv.40–45, also, is evidently Deuteronomistic; see D.i.41–43, and *comp.* especially the expression 'be smitten before those hating you,' N.xiv.42, with similar expressions occurring *only* (in the Pentateuch) in D.i.42, xxviii.7,25, and L.xxvi.17; and L.xxvi, again, is, as we believe, a Deuteronomistic insertion; and at all events it is pronounced by KUENEN, *Eng.Ed.p.*207, to be of *later* origin than L.xviii–xx, while these three chapters

It is plain, also, (at least, for Bp. BROWNE and Mr. PEROWNE,) that he lived *in the early part of David's reign*, when all good men must have known and used the name Jehovah, if it really originated as the Pentateuch states, and was recognised, as all the history (written in later days) would imply, from the time of Moses downwards, as the covenant-Name of the God of Israel. This phenomenon, as we have said, is fully explained by the supposition that the name did *not* so originate—that it was a name first introduced among them, for higher religious purposes, in later days than those of the Exodus,—most probably in the days of Samuel. What other rational account can be given of the matter? Bp. BROWNE gives up the point in despair, and says, *p.*67, 'We are not *bound* to explain all the anomalies in the use of the names Elohim and Jehovah by the different sacred writers.' Mr. PEROWNE says, *p.*lxxxiv, 'No probable explanation of the phenomenon has yet been given.'

53. I retain the conviction that the explanation, which I have given, is the probable and the true one. But *if not*—what then? If all Bp. BROWNE's reasoning had been as sound as I have shown it to be unsound and fallacious,—if he had been able to produce triumphantly Psalm after Psalm decidedly *Jehovistic* and yet *of ancient date*—more ancient than that of Ps.lxviii—Psalms in which the 'marks of high antiquity' were indisputable, and in which also there were plain signs of a style identical with that of *later Elohistic* Psalms, so that these were apparently written by the same author—if thus, by real substantial argument of this kind, he had demolished my theory about the general greater antiquity of the Psalms of Book II,—he would have only struck away one of the subsidiary props of my main conclusion. I have exposed, as I conceive, the weakness of the reasonings which he has himself advanced, though they were 'very likely to impose upon all such as mistake the unknown for the magnificent,' *p.*v. But I am still open to conviction. I shall

---

are according to him, *p.*71, 'in their present form *younger than Solomon*,' and according to OORT, *Het Menschenoffer in Israel*, *p.*123, 'transfer us into the very same age as Deuteronomy.'

Thus the formula in question, and its kindred formulæ, appear to be in every instance the special property of the Deuteronomist. On the other hand, in the other portions of the Pentateuch we have always 'Ark of the Testimony,' E.xxv.22, xxvi.33,34, xxx.6,26, xxxi.7, xxxix.35, xl.3,5,21, N.iv.5, vii.89, Jo.iv.16$^{b}$, *comp.* 'Tabernacle of the Testimony,' E.xxxviii.21,N.i.50,53,53,ix.15,x.11,xvii.7,8,xviii.2, 'Vail of the Testimony,' L.xxiv.3,—not one of which phrases is used by the Deuteronomist.

From the above phenomena, it seems to be almost certain that the passage N.x.33-36, is really, as I had conjectured, of later origin than Ps.lxviii,—but of *Deuteronomistic* origin, instead of merely *Jehovistic*, as suggested in (II.408). And a further confirmation of this may be seen, perhaps, in the fact that in N.x.36, we have רִבְבָה 'ten thousand,' as in D.xxxii.30, xxxiii.2,17, and only twice besides in the Pentateuch, *viz.* G.xxiv.60, which we have already assigned to the Deuteronomist (145), and L.xxvi.8, which we believe (as above) to be also due to the same writer.

carefully review and reconsider the question as to the ages of the different Psalms, with such aids as the researches of the great modern critical school will supply. And, of course, it is *possible* that I may be brought by sounder arguments to see that the ground which I have taken, and *still maintain*, on this particular point is untenable. I should not then have the corroboration from the Psalms, which I now claim. I should not have the satisfaction of accounting rationally for a perplexing phenomenon. But the other grounds, on which my conclusions are based, would remain as strong as ever. And as to the remarkable phenomena in the Psalms, I should have the same right as Bp. BROWNE has exercised, to say—'I am not bound to explain' the anomalous use of the Sacred Names in the Psalms.

54. I will add only one more remark. In maintaining that Ps.lx and Ps.lxviii, and probably also Ps.li, are really Psalms of the Davidic age, I am maintaining strictly the *traditionary* view: and I do so conscientiously, with the strong conviction, which has not been shaken as yet by any arguments which I have seen advanced to the contrary, that these three Psalms—at all events, two of them—*are* certainly Davidic Psalms. But, whoever admits this, must admit also, as it seems to me, that these Psalms exhibit very strong evidence in favour of my theory as to the later introduction of the Name Jehovah into the religious history of Israel.

55. But so, too, with regard to the Pentateuch itself, in maintaining that the Elohistic and Jehovistic narratives date from as early a time as that of SAUL and DAVID, I am maintaining also, *as far as possible*, the traditionary view. I am carrying back the composition of the main portions of the story of the Exodus to a time when some real reminiscences of the march through the wilderness—some veritable traces of the Laws and Institutions which they brought with them into Canaan—might be expected to be still retained in Israel,—instead of, with some eminent modern critics, ascribing them to a much lower date, when all such traditions must have been lost, or have become utterly untrustworthy. In short, the question among critical scholars is now—not whether the Elohist lived at an *earlier* time than that of Samuel, but—whether he must not be placed in a *later* age than that to which, for the reasons given in this volume, in accordance mainly also with BOEHMER's conclusions, I have with some confidence assigned him.

# APPENDIX III.

## ON THE NAME IAO.

(Translated and abridged from MOVERS's *Phönizie*, Chap.xiv,*p.*539–558.)

1. This mysterious Being, to whom we have already referred at different times, belongs to the Phœnician Religion; and his name is indicated as Phœnician by the ancients themselves in the passages quoted below from JOHANNES LYDUS and CEDRENUS.

2. We shall first, however, lay at the base of our enquiry the important extract from MACROBIUS, *Saturn.*i.18, which we here produce in its proper connection.

'Orpheus manifestly declares the Sun to be Dionysos in the following verse:—

Ἥλιος, ὃν Διόνυσον ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσιν,

[*Hēlios* (*the Sun*), *whom men surname Dionysos.*]

That verse, indeed, is more complete and decisive; but this of the same poet is more elaborate:—

Εἷς Ζεύς, εἷς Ἀΐδης, εἷς Ἥλιος, εἷς Διόνυσος,

[*One Zeus, one Aïdēs, one Hēlios, one Dionysos.*]

The authority of this verse rests upon an oracle of the Clarian Apollo, in which another name also of the Sun is given, who in these same sacred lines is called Ἰαώ, IAO. For the Clarian Apollo, having been consulted as to which of the gods was to be considered to be the one who is called IAO, pronounced thus:—

Ὄργια μὲν δεδαῶτας ἐχρῆν νηπευθέα κεύθειν,
Ἐνδ' ἀπάτῃ παύρῃ σύνεσιν καὶ νοῦς ἀλαπαδνός.
Φρᾶζεο τὸν πάντων ὕπατον θεὸν ἔμμεν Ἰαώ,
Χείματι μέν τ' Ἀΐδην, Δία τ' εἴαρος ἀρχομένοιο,
Ἥέλιον δὲ θέρους, μετοπώρου δ' ἀβρὸν Ἰαώ.*

[*It was right that those knowing should hide the ineffable orgies; for in a little deceit there is prudence and an adroit mind. Explain that* IAO *is the Most High God of all,—in winter Aïdes, and Zeus in commencing spring, and Hēlios in summer, and at the end of autumn tender* IAO.]

The meaning of this oracle, the interpretation of the deity, and the name,

* LOBECK, *Aglaophamus*, *p.*461, reads here Ἄδωνιν for Ἰάω (Ἰαώ, Ἰαῶ).

according to which IAO signifies Father Bacchus and the Sun, has been worked out by CORNELIUS LABEO in a book, entitled '*Concerning the Oracle of the Clarian Apollo.*'

3. From the time when JABLONSKY pretended that this oracle of the Clarian Apollo was merely a composition of a Christian gnostic living in Egypt, it has been, and is still, regarded generally by theologians as spurious. (*Comp.* THOLUCK, *Litter. Anzeiger*, 1832, *p.*222, CÖLLN, *Bibl. Theologie*, i.*p.*102, VATKE, *Bibl. Theologie*, i.*p.*669, HENGSTENBERG, *Beitr.* ii.*p.*219, GESENIUS, *Thes.* ii.*p.*557.) In coming to this conclusion, they have assumed that this IAO is the same as the Hebrew IHVH; and they have taken no notice whatever of the passages out of LYDUS and CEDRENUS.

4. But here they have lost sight altogether of the fact, that a spurious apocryphal writing out of this workshop could never have attained the distinction that a CORNELIUS LABEO should have written a special commentary on it. This remark has been already made by LOBECK, *Aglaoph. p.*461; and he has added also very justly that the beautiful, well-rounded, versification of the oracle contrasts too much with the rude halting verses of apocryphal productions of this kind, to allow of our deriving it from so stupid a source.

5. JABLONSKY'S reasons are also very unimportant, and altogether unworthy of mention. And, in fact, his whole argumentation proceeds only from the desire to snatch up here a notice for *Egyptian* mythology, according to which, forsooth, the 'elegant IAO' would be Harpocrates. (*Comp.* PRICHARD, *Egypt. Myth. p.*111.) I will spare myself the space that would be required for its formal contradiction; since each of my readers will at once contradict it for himself, when placed in the right point of view for forming a judgment as to this oracle and the other notices about IAO, by means of the comparison and critical valuation of them, which will here be given.

6. First, we see generally from the oracle of the Clarian Apollo, which is here quoted by MACROBIUS as explaining the nature of the unknown IAO,—who also, according to him, is no other than Hēlios or Dionysos,—that this name IAO was of a *mysterious* kind. There was a great fondness for such names in eastern religions. And so in Egypt Hermes had an ineffable name (CICERO *de Nat. Deor.* iii.22, *Schömann*); and whoever attained to the knowledge of the true name of the Moon-goddess was a 'child of death.'

7. JAMBLICHUS, in his work *De Mysteriis*, speaks repeatedly of such mysterious (Egyptian or Chaldæan) Divine Names. In reply to Porphyry he remarks that they were not 'names without meaning, ἄσημα ὀνόματα.' 'The signification of some,' he says, vii.4, 'had been imparted by the gods themselves, as, in fact, the Egyptian Deity, Thoth, had, according to Plutarch, composed a book about them: but others were too holy for their meaning to be made known. Those, however, which could be understood by men, gave explanation about the might and order in rank of the gods, and through them the soul was *led-up* to the Deity.'

8. JAMBLICHUS adds yet further that there was another mysterious reason, why the secret names of the gods were (Assyrian) Chaldæan or Egyptian. 'The Assyrians

or Egyptians were holy nations, and their language was a holy language, the language of the gods; and it was fitting that men should also address the gods in a language known to them.'

To such mysterious names belong, for instance, Μεῦ, Θρεῦ, Μῶρ, Φῶρ, Τεῦξ, Ζᾶ, Ζῶν, Θέ, Λοῦ, Χρῖ, Γῆ, Ζέ, Ὧν, &c. GALE *On Jamblichus, p.*290.

9. Next, we see from the oracle of Apollo that IAO was 'the Most High God of all,' and was in reality the Sun-Deity, in a fourfold signification, with which may, perhaps, be compared the fact, that according to a statement of EUSTATHIUS, Baal was represented with *four faces*, (MUNTER, *Rel. der Karth. p.*40), and that Manasseh also is said to have erected in the temple at Jerusalem an image of Jupiter with four faces (SUIDAS, Μανασσῆς).

In a wider signification of the name, then, IAO was the Sun-God in the four seasons. But, in a narrower sense, ἁβρὸς Ἰαώ, 'the tender IAO,' is given as the title of the *autumnal* Sun.* And that this 'tender IAO' is *Adonis*, admits of no doubt whatever.

10. In the first place, the description itself, '*tender* IAO,' suits Adonis, to whom this epithet is especially applied:—

> Κέκλιται ἁβρὸς Ἄδωνις ἐν ἑλμασι πορφυρέοισι.—BION, *Idyl.* i.79.
> [*Renowned is tender Adonis in purple vestments.*]
> Ἄλλοι δ' ἁβρὸν Ἄδωνιν ἐπευφήμισαν ἀοιδοί.—PROCL. *ad Solem, v.*24.
> [*And other singers celebrated the tender Adonis.*]

And he is also very commonly called ἁγνὸς Ἄδωνις, *holy Adonis*, (see below and *comp.* THEOCRITUS, xv.128).

Again, it is only true, if used of Adonis, that IAO, according to its wider signification, is the Sun-God, and in its narrower, the *harvest*-Deity, as we have seen already (MOV. *Phön.* vii), and expressly as to the latter point with reference to the worship of Adonis at Antioch and Byblus.

11. Further, Adonis was actually named in Byblus and in Lebanon 'the Most High God,' exactly as here IAO is styled in the oracle.

Thus SANCHONIATHON names the god, who in Byblus was called pre-eminently 'the Most Great of the gods,' Agrueros, whose symbol, he says, was carried about upon a wagon drawn by oxen, and in his usual manner he ascribes to him the invention of forecourts to houses and the use of caverns. And who can be meant here but Adonis?

12. First, Byblus was the sacred town of Adonis (ἱερά ἐστι τοῦ Ἀδώνιδος,' STRABO, xvi.*p.*364,) and was named from him in consequence 'the holy Byblus, (ECKHEL, iii.*p.*361). Here was the chief seat of his worship; his myth was here localised; and he was honoured by the stream being named from him 'Adonis.' It is now called by the Arabs *Nahr Ibrahim*, 'the stream of Abraham,'—doubtless, because Adonis was formerly called אַב רָם, *Ab-ram*, 'high father,' or 'Ραμὰς ὁ

---

* LOBECK, as we have seen, note *p.*305, reads Ἄδωνιν for Ἰαώ in the fifth line of the oracle, and so identifies at once IAO with Adonis.

ὑψίστος θεός, 'Ramas, the Most High God,' HESYCH.: *comp.* אֲדֹנִירָם, *Adoni-ram*, 'high lord,' 1K.iv.6, probably named after him. [*Comp.* below (15), and observe also that this 'Adoniram' was expressely set over the courses of men, who worked for Solomon on *Lebanon*, 2K.v.14, of which neighbourhood he may have been a native.]

13. Again, all the rest, which SANCHONIATHON tells us about Agrueros, suits exactly the worship of Adonis at Byblus. The wooden symbol in his temple, mentioned by PLUTARCH, *i.e*, a *phallus*, which was carried about on a wagon,—the invention of the caves, in which his mourning-feast was celebrated, and of the fore-court, in which his images were stationed,—the distinction of him as the Deity presiding over agriculture, *Adoni-sadeh*, 'lord of the field,' [*comp. Hymn. Orph.*lvi. 12],—all these point distinctly to the fact, that 'the Most Great of the gods' at Byblus was no other than Adonis.

14. Accordingly, in SOCRATES, *Eccl. Hist.*iii.23, in an oracle not unlike that of the Clarian Apollo, Adonis is called distinctly 'Dionysos' and 'the Great God,' the Rhodians being there advised in a time of calamity,—

Ἄττιν ἱλάσκεσθαι, θεὸν μέγαν, ἁγνὸν Ἄδωνιν,
Εὔβιον, ὀλβιόδωρον, εὐπλόκαμον Διόνυσον,
[*To appease Attis, the Great God, the holy Adonis,*
*Happy in life, wealthy in gifts, the fair-haired Dionysos.*]

15. So, too, in Lebanon Adonis was named 'pre-eminently the Most Great of the gods,' ἐξαιρέτως θεῶν ὁ μέγιστος, to use the language employed by SANCHONIATHON with reference to the god at Byblus. In fact, OTTO VON RICHTER found at Kalaat-Fakra [on Lebanon], in the neighbourhood of Aphaca at the Adonis-stream, in the ruins of an old temple, similar also in its remains to the renowned sanctuary at Aphaca, the following inscription (*Wallfahrten im Morgenlande, p.*100–102):—

ΡΑΒΒΟΜΟΥ ΕΠΙΜΕΛΗ ΕΚ ΤΩΝ ΤΟΥ ΜΕΓΙΣΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΟΚΟΔΟΜΗΘΗ,

[*It was built by the care of Rabbomus,* of the (priests) of the Most Great God.*]

From this we perceive that at the sanctuaries of Adonis in Lebanon there was a priesthood, and that here also,—as in Byblus, according to SANCHONIATHON—Adonis was named 'pre-eminently the Most Great God.'

16. Again, SANCHONIATHON himself intimates that the Deity of Lebanon, as well as that of Byblus, was also 'the Most High God.' For he names him Ἔλιουν ὁ καλούμενος Ὕψιστος, 'Eliun [*comp.* עֶלְיוֹן, G.xiv.18,19,20,22], called Most High,' who had lived *in the district of Byblus*, and had been torn to pieces *while hunting wild*

---

* The name of this priest Rabbomus, רַב בָּמָה, signifies 'prince of the high-place.' רַב, which means properly 'great-one,' is the name given also to the Chaldæan priests, Jer.xxxix.3, as the Hebrew priests in later times were named שָׂרִים, 'princes,' Is.xliii.28, Jer.xxxv.4, 1Ch.xxiv.5, Ezr.viii.20; *comp.* Jer.xxxix.3, שָׂרֵי מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל with *v.*13, רַבֵּי מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל; and the word, therefore, stands quite on a par with the 'priests or (princes) of the high-places,' כֹּהֲנֵי־הַבָּמוֹת so often named in the O.T., 1K.xii.32,xiii.33, 2K.xvii.32,xxiii.9,20.

*beasts*, p.24,—where also the reference is obvious to Adonis killed in Lebanon near Byblus by the tusk of the wild boar. As 'the Most High God,' he stands in SANCHONIATHON uppermost in a theogony, and after him his son Uranus, from his connection with Γῆ surnamed Ἐπίγειος, whom, as usual elsewhere, Saturn follows. From this it is plain that Adonis was regarded as the Primary Being, corresponding to the *ancient* Bel with Tauthe, who is here Berut, the Venus of Lebanon.

17. Further, Adonis, too, had his mysterious name, just as IAO is indicated by MACROBIUS as the mysterious designation of the Sun-God. This seems to be implied at once by the mysterious suppression of the name of the deity in the inscription above-quoted, in which Rabbomus names himself as one of the priests of 'the Most Great God,' without mentioning at all the name of the Deity.

18. Adonis also was evidently called Ἰαώ or Ἰεύω, since we find the following notice in TZETZES *ad Lycophr.* 831:—

ὁ Ἄδωνις Γαύας παρὰ Κυπρίοις καλεῖται,

[*Adonis is called* Γαύας *among the Cyprians,*]

where, manifestly through an error of pronunciation or of writing, Ἰαύας has been transformed into Γαύας.

19. This result is indirectly confirmed by a second class of instances, in which we have more or less evident traces of the name IAO. We have seen that MACROBIUS identifies IAO with Hēlios and Dionysos; and JOANNES LYDUS likewise says that Dionysos bore this name among the Chaldees. When, then, as in the passages quoted below, IAO appears generally, under different forms, as the name of *Dionysos*, the same holds good also of *Adonis*; since the ideas of these two deities pass over into one another, and the meaning of IAO, יַחְוֶה, ['he lives' or 'he makes to live' = Giver of Life], suits the characters of both.

20. And, in fact, the conjunction of Adonis and Dionysos, whether it was only a theocrasy of later times or not, was very common indeed,—like that of Adonis and Osiris, at Byblus, Amathus, and Alexandria, or at Rhodes, as in the passage cited below. And, so PLUTARCH says, *Sympos.*iv. *quest.*v.3—

Λέγεται μὲν ὁ Ἄδωνις ὑπὸ τοῦ συὸς διαφθαρῆναι· τὸν δ' Ἄδωνιν οὐχ ἕτερον ἀλλὰ Διόνυσον εἶναι νομίζουσι,

[*Adonis is said to have been destroyed by the boar; but they consider Adonis to be no other than Dionysos.*]

21. Most noticeable here is the manner in which the ancients confounded this name with the יהוה of the Hebrews: *comp.* TAC. *Hist.*v.5. From PLUTARCH, *Sympos.*iv.6, it is clear that a name having a like sound with יהוה, and supposed by him consequently to be the name of the Hebrew Deity, was an ἄῤῥητον—an unutterable name—of Dionysos. In the section, which immediately follows the passage just quoted, the question is thrown out by Symmachus.

Ἆρα σὺ τὸν πατριώτην θεὸν, ὦ Λαμπρία, εὔιον, ὀρσιγύναικα, μαινομέναις ἀνθέοντα τιμαῖσι, Διόνυσον, ἐγγράφεις καὶ ὑποποιεῖς Ἑβραίων ἀπορῥήτοις; ἢ τῷ ὄντι λόγος ἐστί τις ὁ τοῦτον ἐκείνῳ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀποφαίνων;

*Do you, then, O Lamprias, enrol and adopt among the unutterable things of the*

*Hebrews the god of our country, Dionysus, 'Evius,' 'rouser of women,' 'flourishing with raving honours'? Or is there really any reason which shows plainly that this deity is the same as that?*

22. And this is the reply, from one initiated in the Athenian Dionysia:—

*Ἔα τοῦτον, εἶπεν ὁ Μοιραγένης, ἐγὼ γὰρ, Ἀθηναίος ὤν, ἀποκρίνομαί σοι καὶ λέγω, μηδένα ἄλλον εἶναι· καὶ τὰ μὲν πολλὰ τῶν εἰς τοῦτο τεκμηρίων μόνοις ἐστὶ ῥητὰ καὶ διδακτὰ τοῖς μυημένοις παρ' ἡμῖν ἐς τὴν τριετηρικὴν παντελείαν· ἃ δὲ λόγῳ διελθεῖν οὐ κεκώλυται πρὸς φίλους ἄνδρας, ἄλλως τε καὶ παρ' οἴνον ἐπὶ τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ δώροις, ἂν οὗτοι κελεύσωσι, λέγειν ἕτοιμος.*

*'Don't trouble him,' said Moiragenes; 'for I, Athenian as I am, answer you and say that he is no other. And, indeed, most of the evidences for this can only be told and taught to those initiated with us into the full triennial solemnity. But those points, which it is not forbidden to discourse of with friends, especially when at wine over the gifts of the god, I am ready to speak about, if these should desire it.'*

23. But that these ἄῤῥητα are here said to be common to the Hebrews and Athenians in consequence of the similarly-sounding Divine Names, is clear at once from what follows, where it is said that the Hebrews, some days after the Feast of Tabernacles, celebrated another Festival, which was named outright and not enigmatically the feast of Bacchus, (*ἑορτὴν οὐκ ἂν δι' αἰνιγμάτων, ἀλλ' ἄντικρυς Βάκχου καλουμένου,*)—at which they called upon the god by name (*ἀνακαλούμενοι τὸν θεόν*) with trumpet-sounds. At the triennial festival of Dionysos, in fact, the repeated cry was *ἴα*: and *hallelu*-YAH was sounded also as the festival-cry of the Levites, in the temple-songs, with trumpet-clang. And this 'festival of Bacchus,' which the Hebrews 'named with his proper name,' is clearly חג יהוה, 'the Feast of IHVH,' as the Feast of Tabernacles was named, and especially the last day of it.

24. Again, the following numerous names of Dionysus carry us back at once to the Semitic forms חוה, חיים, חיים, יחוה, יחו,—the relation to which is evident from the fact, that the singular and plural forms, חוה, חיים, both meaning 'life,' appear identically among these names as EVA and EVIM, just as the LXX represent the name of Eve, חוה, in G.iv.1, by Εὔα, though they have Ζωή in G.iii.20.

Thus HESYCHIUS has Εὔας, *Διόνυσος*; and again he has—

Εὔα, *ἐπευφημισμὸς ἡλιακὸς καὶ μυστικός,*

[*Eua, a mystical exclamation having reference to the Sun.*]

From these are derived other forms:—

*ὁ αὐτὸς* (*Διόνυσος*) Ὗας *καὶ* Εὐΐμος *καλεῖται, Schol. ad Aristoph. Av. p.*583,

[*the same* (*Dionysos*) *is called Uas and Euimos*];

Εὐΐος, Ἰήιος, ATHEN.viii. *p.*363;

Ἴϋος, *Schol. ad Aristoph. Thesm. p.*841;

Ὗας, Ὕης, PLUT. *de Isid.*xxxiv;

Γύης, *Διόνυσος*, HESYCH., *comp.* Γαύας, = Ἰαύας, as in (18), for the name of Adonis;

*Evan*,—Evantes, a Libero, qui Evan dicitur, SERVIUS *ad Aen.*vi.517;

*Ebon*, the name of the Steer-Dionysos, MACROB. *Sat.*i.18;

Ἴακχος, = יחוה, the cry of joy used at the birth-festival of Dionysus, ARRIAN, *Exp. Alex.*ii.16;

*Bacchus*, according to PLUTARCH's explanation, seems to be only an intentional corruption of the sacred Ἴακχος.

25. Thus we have confirmed completely the statement of CORNELIUS LABEO, that the mysterious IAO is Dionysos,—not only through the explanations in PLUTARCH, according to which the ἄῤῥητον Ἰάω and Ἴακχος are regarded as being one and the same with יהוה, but through these multifarious names, which have to be explained from the Phœnician tongue, whether we look at the Phœnician origin of the worship of Dionysos, or at the express statement of LYDUS *de Mens.*iv.*p.*74 :—

οἱ Χαλδαῖοι τὸν Θεὸν (Διόνυσον) Ἰαὼ λέγουσι, τῇ Φοινίκων γλώσσῃ,

[*the Chaldæans call the god* (*Dionysos*) *IAO, in the tongue of the Phœnicians.*]

26. Thus the ευα in εὐάζω, εὐασμὸς, εὖα, εὔας, corresponds to חוה, and ενιμ in εὐίμος to the plural חוים. So the LXX, as we have seen, represent חוה by Εὔα, G.iv.1, for which JOSEPHUS has Εὔα or Εὐέα, and elsewhere we find Ἔοια and Ἔβδά. (*comp.* FABRICIUS, *Cod.Pseud.Vet.Test. i.p.*103, *remark*). So, too, the LXX express חו by Ευ in the Proper Names, Εὐαῖος = חִוִּי, *Khivvi*, 'Hivite,' G.x.17, and Εὐιλάτ = חֲוִילָה, *Khăvilah*, 'Havilah,' G.ii.11. Accordingly, this was the cry of the festival of the Sabazia, where the women, wreathed with snakes, as symbols of the living power of Nature, shouted Εὔα, CLEM. ALEX. *Protrept.p.*11.

27. A second form, Ἰηίος, and Ἄτης—perhaps, derived from יחיה, יחי, 'he lives!'—was a similar cry of joy at the Dionysia, whence the Ὕης Ἄττης, Ἄττης Ὕης, 'lives Attes! Attes lives!' of that Festival. With this I compare the remark of JULIUS FIRMICUS about the resurrection of Attes, *de Err. prof.Rel. p.*5 :—

quem paulo ante sepelierant, revixisse jactant,—

[*whom they had buried just before, they declare to have revived,*]—

and that also of LUCIAN about the Adonia, *de Syr. Dea*, vi :—

πρῶτα μὲν καταγίζουσι Ἀδώνιδι, ὅκως νέκυϊ, μετὰ δὲ τῇ ἑτερῇ ἡμέρᾳ ζώειν τέ μιν μυθολογέουσι,—

[*first, they perform funereal rites to Adonis, as being dead; but afterwards, on the third day, they fable also that he is alive.*]

28. This mysterious triliteral, however, Ἰαώ, is manifestly יְחוֹ, the apocopated Hiphil of יַחֲוֶה, 'he makes to live,'—formed as so many names in Hebrew are, in exact correspondence with the tetragrammaton, יהוה, apoc. יהו, and with the apocopated forms, which appear in the names ישראל, ירובעל, &c. We should express this name with an aspirate *kh* as *Yakho*; and this expression is probably the mystical Ἴακχος.

29. The forms of the Hebrew Sacred Name יהוה in heathen writers, Ἰευώ, PHILO, *Sanch. p.*2, and Ἰαώ, DIOD. SIC. i.94, are certainly not derived from the tetragrammaton of the Hebrews, but according to the usual confusion of יהוה with Dionysos.

With respect to Ἰευώ, this is probably placed beyond dispute through the expression ευ; for הו would hardly have been expressed by ευ, as חו is, but by αυ, as in Βάαν for בחו and Ταυθέ for תהותא. And so says JEROME, *Opp.* ii.*p.*522 :—

Idioma linguæ illius est per HE (ה) scribere, sed per A legere,
[*It is the idiom of that tongue to write by* ה, *but to read by A*,]—
HE littera, quæ per A legitur,
[*The letter* ה, *which is read by A.*]

In accordance with this, יהוה would have been expressed by Ἰαυέ or Ἰαυώ, [which, in fact, is said to have been the name of Adonis, see (18) above,] and not Ἰευώ; whereas this expression, as well as Ἰαυές [?], could have been very well employed to represent יהו or יהוה.

30. Also, the ω in the final syllable of Ἰαώ must be explained, probably, from the triliteral יהן, and hardly from Ἰαβέ, the Samaritan mode of pronouncing יהוה. It is true the Church-Fathers probably wrote יהו thus: but the name was not spoken by the Jews (Ges. *Thes.p.*576); and they seem to have been led astray by the usual confusion of יהו with יהן (Ἰαώ).

31. Lastly, it would seem that, in compound words, where יהן was appended, the final ן in the expression disappeared, and, exactly as in the case of יה for יהו among the Hebrews, it was pronounced יה,—as *e.g.* in the name of the cosmogonic Κολπία, which, according to the context in Sanchoniathon, can hardly denote anything else than *vox oris vivificantis*, 'the voice of the life-giving mouth,' קל פי יהו. Also the names Ἀβδαῖος, a Tyrian Suffete in Menander, Joseph. *c.Ap.*i.18,—where, according to all analogies of Personal Names compounded with *Abd*, עֶבֶד, a Divine Name is to be sought in the last syllable,—and Βιθύας or, Βιθίας, a Punic Name, Ges. *Mon.p.*403, *comp. Æn.*i.738,—are without doubt to be explained from the Phœnician יה, יהו, יהוה, and certainly not from the Hebrew יה, יהו, יהוה. The first of these would signify 'servant of IAO,' עבדיה,—[*comp.* עבדיה, 'Obadiah,' 1Ch.iii.21, and עבדיאל, 'Abdiel,' 1Ch.v.15,]—the second, 'man of IAO,' בתוח or בתיה,—[*comp.* בתיה, 'Bithiah,' 1Ch.iv.18, and בתואל, 'Bethuel,' 1Ch.iv.30].

32. A third class of passages, belonging to this part of our subject, makes IAO known to us as a deity of the *Chaldæans*. I will here state the evidence of this at full length, by which I shall, perhaps, do a service to many of my readers. The discourse has been previously about Dionysos, and the writer proceeds as follows:—

*The Chaldæans call the Deity IAO, which means in the tongue of the Phœnicians 'Intelligent Light'* (φῶς νοητόν); *and He is often also called 'Sabaoth,' as being over the seven* (*poles*) *heavens, that is, the Creator* (ὁ δημιουργός). Lydus, *de Mens.* iv.38,*p.*74.

With this may be compared another passage of Lydus, *de Mens.*iv.98,*p.*112:—

*Of Sabaoth, the Creator; for thus among the Phœnicians is the creative number named.*

The first of these passages is found also in Cedrenus, i.*p.*296, in a different connection, and with the name corrupted:—

*For* (ἡ ἀώ, read Ἰαώ) *IAO among the Chaldæans is interpreted to mean in the tongue of the Phœnicians 'Intelligent Light,' and Sabbath also* (*to mean*) *'over the seven heavens,' that is, the Creator-Deity.*

33. Thus, then, we obtain the following new ideas about IAO:—

(i) He was throned above the 'seven heavens' of the Chaldæans;

(ii) He was a Light-Being, and, in fact, the holy Light-Principle, 'Intelligent Light,'—out of which, according to Chaldeeism, all spiritual beings emanated;

(iii) He was regarded as Creator.

That all this suits only the character of the god Bel [*i.e.* the Sun], will have been seen already from what has been set forth in a previous chapter.

34. Perhaps, here many of my readers may be inclined to conjecture that this IAO and Sabaoth, (names which appear also on the Abraxas gems of the Gnostics,) are no other than the יהוה צבאות 'IHVH of Hosts,' of the O.T.,—שבעות, *Sabaoth*, 'seven,' being only an awkward corruption of צבאות, *Zabaoth*, 'Hosts.' But, obvious as this may at first sight appear, yet it will be seen to be groundless when we consider more at length the ideas of IAO and Sabaoth, as they appear in the connection of the Chaldee system, of which, however, the remains are found only in the writings of the Neo-Platonists. These ideas are separated heaven-wide from that of 'IHVH Zabaoth' among the Hebrews, and belong entirely to Chaldeeism; so that we cannot suppose a misunderstanding of the name.

35. This Chaldee IAO and Sabaoth, 'the Seven,' is the mysterious being of Chaldeeism, who is elsewhere called 'the leader-up and the seven-rayed' (ὁ ἀναγωγεὺς καὶ ὁ ἑπτάκτις, PROCLUS in *Timæum*, *p.*11,) and whose ineffable name is this very IAO and Sabaoth, which we find in LYDUS and CEDRENUS. That the 'seven-rayed' god had his secret name, which was only imparted to the initiated, is seen from the following passage in JULIAN, *Orat.* v. *in Matrem Deor.*, *p.*172:—

'But, if I should touch upon ineffable mystical lore (μυσταγωγία), which the Chaldæan raves about the seven-rayed god, *leading-up* souls by him, I should say things unknown—yes, utterly unknown to the rabble,—though well-known to the blessed ministers of Divine things. Wherefore, I will be silent about them now.'

36. Compare the above with what JAMBLICHUS says about the 'leading-up' of the soul by means of those holy names, the meaning of which has been revealed by the gods,—'the sacred names of the gods, and the other divine symbols, which lead-up the soul,' *de Myst.* i.12,—as where he writes as follows, vii.4:—

*As to those Divine Names, however, the knowledge of whose meaning has been imparted to us, by these we have the knowledge of the Divine Essence, and Power, and Order, completely contained in the Name; and besides, we maintain thus entire in the soul the mystical and ineffable image of the gods; and by means of these we lead-up the soul to the gods.*

37. This view of the holiness of the Name of God is precisely that of the Rabbies, who teach that all other names of the Divine Being denote only *individual peculiarities of His Nature*, whereas the Tetragrammaton reveals the proper nature of the Deity, (GALLATIN *de Arcanis Cath. Fid.* ii.10,*p.*53). The 'leading-up' of souls through the holy Names took place, no doubt, through meditation upon their meaning, as among the Indians, (MÜLLER, *Glauben, Wissen, und Kunst der alten Hindus*, i.*p.*103):—

'Who meditates upon the nature of OUM, He must mount by the great heart-

string of nature, as a ladder; he must lay hold of and press through the world; for only thus he reaches Brahm.'

38. That, however, these holy names, to which JAMBLICHUS refers, were the names of the 'seven-rayed' god of the Chaldees, IAO and Sabaoth, appears further from the manner in which the Chaldee deity is connected and compared,—or, rather, as usual, confounded,—with the Hebrew Deity. Thus in DAMASCIUS, Theosebius adjures a demon by both names, PHOTIUS, *Bibl.p.*339:—

ὥρκιζε δὲ τὰς τοῦ ἡλίου προτείνων ἀκτῖνας καὶ τὸν Ἑβραῖον θεόν,

*so he adjured him, quoting the rays of the Sun and the Hebrew God.*

Here, evidently, the god with 'rays' is no other than Sabaoth, the 'seven-rayed,' and the 'Hebrew god' is IAO,—both mysteriously not named by DAMASCIUS, but certainly supposed by him, erroneously, to be identical with IHVH.

39. And so JULIAN, who in his passage above-quoted (35) speaks so mysteriously about IAO, confounds him in like manner with IHVH, and speaks just in the same style as there about him, CYRILL. *adv. Julian.p.*148, (*Migne*, vol.lxxvi.*p.*727):—

ὁ τοῦ κόσμου δημιουργὸς, ὁ κηρυττόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Μωσέως, ἡμεῖς ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ βελτίους ἔχομεν δόξας,

*as to the Creator of the world, who is proclaimed by Moses, we hold better opinions about him.*

Here, again, we have the same mysterious treatment of the names, and the boasting that a higher insight into the nature of the Creator, IAO, was attainable through the mysteries of the Chaldæans,—just exactly as in the former passage.

40. Yet more plainly is JHVH confounded with the ἀναγωγεύς, 'leader-up,' in another passage of JULIAN, CYRILL. *adv. Julian, p.*141, (*Migne*, vol.lxxvi.*p.*713):—

*Even supposing the Deity, who is honoured by the Hebrews, to be the proximate* (προσεχής) *Creator of the world,—yet, since our views about Him are better than theirs, it follows that He has given to us blessings greater than theirs, both for the soul and externally.*

41. Elsewhere ORIGEN also reports, *cont. Celsum*, v.*p.*613, (*Migne*, ii.*p.*1253), in accordance with Damascius, that the name 'Sabaoth' was used in taking oaths. But this cannot possibly have been the God of the Hebrews, who was so despised by the heathen; since certainly צְבָאוֹת has no meaning by itself, and is unintelligible except in connection with the name 'IHVH,' in the phrase 'IHVH of Hosts.'

The mystical word 'Abraxas' is clearly formed from the same word for 'seven,' being only a corrupt pronunciation of שבע רבא, 'the Great Seven.'

42. If, in accordance with what precedes, 'Sabaoth' is the Greek ἑπτάκτις, we see at once how it is connected with the other name Ἰαώ, meaning, according to LYDUS, 'Intelligent Light.' Let it not be replied that our etymology of the Phœnician name (יחוה, 'Life-giver') does not agree with the idea of the Chaldee IAO, or with the explanation of LYDUS, which certainly is drawn not from the etymology, but from the idea, of IAO. For in this circle of ideas, the notions of *Light* and *Life* flow over into one another: *comp.* St. JOHN's idea of φῶς and ζωή—'In Him was *Life*, and the *Life* was the *Light* of men.'

43. In the Chaldee theosophy, this 'Intelligent Light' is an efflux out of the

intelligent world (*κόσμος νοητός*) of intelligent life (*νοερὰ ζωή*), or it is the Light-Principle, the Light-Ether, (*Bel-Saturn*) out of which souls emanate, and to which, when purged by Divine influences from the dross of sense, they return again, being 'led out' by the *Mediating Being*. This 'Mediator' is otherwise called *Bel-Mithra*, Zeus, especially Zeus-Belus, or *ἥλιος νοητός*, 'the Sun of Intelligence,' *λόγος*, 'the Word,' *μονογένης*, 'the only-begotten,' and, just exactly as with the *logos* of Philo, (whose theology certainly was derived from the Chaldean,) is only the *alter ego* of Bel-Saturn. Hence it is that the ideas of Bel-IAO and his image Bel-Mithra pass over into one another.

44. With reference to this point the following passage from Proclus is noticeable, *in* PLAT. *Alcib.*iv.p.96 —

*Καὶ οἱ θεολόγοι τὴν νοερὰν ζωὴν Κρονείαν προειρήκασιν, ἀλλ' οὐ Δίϊον· καίτοι διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου Δίος ἡ ἄνοδος. Ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ὁ Ζεὺς, τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ πατρὸς πληρούμενος, καὶ εἰς ἐκεῖνον ὡς ἑαυτοῦ νοητὸν ἀναγόμενος, ἀνάγει καὶ τὸ μετ' αὐτὸν, οὕτω δὴ καὶ αἱ ψυχαὶ μετὰ Δίος ποιοῦνται τὴν ἄνοδον.*

*And theologians have named the 'Intelligent Life' after Saturn, but not after Zeus; although it is by means of the Mighty Zeus that the ascent is made. But just as Zeus, being filled with his own Father, and carried-up unto Him as his own Intelligence, carries-up also all that is behind him, so, you see, souls also make the ascent together with Zeus.*

45. In the above passage, which without doubt is taken from the writings of the Chaldæans, the *Father*, the 'Intelligent Life,' is the Light-Principle, Bel-Saturn; whereas the *Son*, who has the 'Fulness of the Light' in Himself, Zeus = Zeus-Belus, is Bel-Mithra, who receives the 'Light-matter,' *ἀκτῖνας τοῦ ἡλίου*, the rays of the Sun, from the Father, pours them out, and restores them again to Him. He is the same also, who appears in JULIAN as Serapis, *Orat. in Solem.p.*136—

*πορεύων ἄνω καὶ ἀνατείνων τὰς ψυχὰς ἐπὶ τὸν νοητὸν κόσμον,*

[*journeying upwards, and reaching up souls to the intelligent world.*]

46. Again, He is the 'seven-rayed' god, who drops down the sparks of spiritual life, and again reaches them up to the Father, PROCL. *in* PLAT. *Alcib.*iii.*p.*190:—

*Εἰκότως ἀρὰ καὶ αἱ τὰ θεῖα σοφοὶ τῷ τῆς ἐπιστήμης χορηγῷ τῶν θεῶν τὴν Πειθὼ συνοικίζουσι, δι' ἧς τὰ πάντα πειθήνια καὶ κατήκοα ποιεῖ τῷ δημιουργῷ τῶν ὅλων, καὶ ἀνατείνει πρὸς τὸν ἕνα πάτερα.*

*With reason, then, also those skilled in Divine matters represent Peitho* (i.e. *Persuasion*) *as residing with the Leader of the science of the gods, through whom He makes all things tractable and obedient to the Creator of all, and reaches them up to the one Father.*

47. Here, again, the Leader or Choir-Leader (Choragus) of the other gods is the Chaldee Sun-God, Bel-Mithra, around whom the Planets perform their dances (*οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν χορεύοντες*, JULIAN, *Or.*p.146); while the *Father* of the Intelligent World is Bel-Saturn, from whom the seven planetary beams pass-over to the Sun-God, and return back again into Himself.

That the Phœnicians also in like manner regarded the Sun-Light as a spiritual power, which emanated from the Most High God or Bel-Saturn, as the Light-

Principle, over the seven poles, may be inferred from the passages of LYDUS in (32). JULIAN, however, expressly states this to have been the view of the Phœnician theology, *loc. cit.p.*134 :—

'Η μὲν οὖν τῶν Φοινίκων δόξα σοφῶν τὰ θεῖα καὶ ἐπιστημόνων, ἄχραιτον εἶναι ἐνεργείαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ καθαροῦ νοῦ τὴν ἀπανταχοῦ προϊοῦσαν αὐγὴν ἔφη.

*The opinion, however, of the Phœnicians, wise and skilful men in divine matters, declared that the ray proceeding forth in all directions was the unmixed energy of the pure Intelligence itself.*

48. If we now glance back at what has been said, the comparison of the above passages about IAO will give us the following results.

(i) IAO is the Sun-God at the different times of the year, with the predominant idea of Adonis as the Harvest-Deity. In general, however, he represents a complexity of nature-deities, whose powers he comprehends in the meaning of his name, which is one full of mystery, and, according to SANCHONIATHON, was taught in the priestly mysteries by the very oldest Phœnician hierophants.

(ii) As Adonis-Elyon, he is the primary Being together with the female goddess of Nature, out of whom was born Uranos-Ge, as Husband and Wife, who parted afterwards from one another into 'Heaven' and 'Earth.'

(iii) His name also was introduced, together with the Dionysia, among the Greeks under various forms.

(iv) In the Chaldee Religion, IAO was a designation of the spiritual principle of Light and Life, and seems to denote sometimes the highest Light-principle (Bel-Saturn), sometimes its efflux and image (Bel-Mithra). All these different ideas, however, are gathered-up in his mysterious name IAO, which denotes him as the Principle of Life.

---

49. MOVERS, it will be seen (5), considers JABLONSKY's reasons, for doubting the genuineness of the oracle of the Clarian Apollo, to be 'very unimportant, and altogether unworthy of mention'; and he does not even trouble himself to discuss them. My surprise was great, on turning to the passage of HENGSTENBERG, *Beitr.*ii.*p.*219, to which MOVERS himself had referred his readers as taking the contrary view, to find that writer making the following statement.

'The pretended oracle of the Clarian Apollo in MACROB. i.*p.*18, on which Von BOHLEN lays so much stress, as showing that Dionysos and the Sun had the name Ἰαώ, has been long recognised as the composition of a gnostic Christian, who has thus endeavoured to smuggle in the dogmas of his sect into the religious system of Egypt. So that, to appeal any further to this, until *the task has been undertaken of refuting the argumentation of* JABLONSKY, *which* Von BOHLEN *does not attempt to do*, would be just as if it were sought to prove the heathen origin of the name 'Jehovah' from the inscription *nuper in Cyrenaicâ reperta*, in which it does, in fact, appear.'

50. It will be observed, however, that the argument of MOVERS does not by any

means depend upon the genuineness of this 'oracle' being indisputable. He has proved his position by such a variety of evidence, that it does not in the least matter, for his purposes or ours, whether the 'oracle' be allowed to be genuine or not. In fact, *our* point is merely to show that a name very closely resembling, if not identical with, the name יהוה, was the name of *some* great deity among the Phœnicians, whoever that deity may have been, the Sun, Adonis, Dionysos, &c. And this point is sufficiently established for us, when we find that Punic names existed, such as Ἀβδαῖος, *Bithias*, Κολπία, confounded with the Divine Name, and corresponding precisely in form to the Hebrew names compounded with יה.

51. And HENSTENBERG himself admits the force of this argument, and writes as follows, *Beitr.*ii.*p.*215:—

'To the Deity, whose name a man appropriated to himself, he devoted himself entirely; he thus announced to all mankind that he regarded that Deity as the Guide and Guardian of his whole life. It would not take the fancy of any one to devote himself in this way to a *strange* God. And therefore it would be better, if the evidence was found valid, [of there being heathen names compounded with יה or יהו,] to modify the statement to this, that the name 'Jehovah' had been among the heathen also an indigenous *epithet* of one of their gods,—in which case the question would still remain, whether the *priority of use* did not belong to Israel.'

52. But, after having read the words of HENGSTENBERG, laying so much stress upon the 'argumentation of JABLONSKY,' I thought it necessary to consult that writer, and now place before my readers the whole of JABLONSKY's reasoning, from which they will be able to judge for themselves whether or not Von BOHLEN was justified in 'not attempting' to refute such arguments, or MOVERS in declaring them to be 'very unimportant and altogether unworthy of mention.'

53. These, then, are the words of JABLONSKY, *Panth. Ægypt.*ii.vi.5,6.

'I believe that the verses attributed to the Clarian Apollo, which we have cited more than once from MACROBIUS, i.18, have also some bearing upon this argument of ours, [*viz.* to show that the Egyptian deity *Harpocrates* was the Sun at the time of his renovation at the end of the year.]

'We have explained distinctly in the preceding books who it is that in these verses is meant by ἀΐδης, 'the Invisible,' in Winter-time, *viz. Serapis*,—who Zeus, in the beginning of Spring, *viz. Ammon*,—who Sol *par excellence*, at Midsummer, *viz. Horus*; and we have confirmed each of these points from the most ancient sacred traditions of the Egyptians. And this may be a proof that in these verses reference is made to the theology, not of the Greeks, but of the Egyptians. That point, however, which may be called most difficult and truly enigmatical in these verses, remains still to be explained; that is, we have to show who is meant by μετοπώρου ἀβρὸς Ἰαώ, which I translate, 'at the end of autumn'—and so at the beginning of winter—'tender IAO.'

'These very words, however, do not allow me to doubt at all that the writer of this oracle, on which so much stress is laid by MACROBIUS, was a Christian from the society of the Gnostics, who, living as he did in Egypt, distorted and adapted the idolatrous theology of that country, which, however, had been based upon the

natural order and succession of things, to the doctrines of that Society to which he had attached himself. *I prefer to defer to another time, and to a more convenient place, a more full demonstration of this matter.* At present I will only note those points which cannot be wholly omitted by me.

'The name Ἰαώ, which is mentioned here, will be regarded by many as the venerable and august tetragrammaton, יהוה; since *it is sufficiently certain that this name, written just in this way, was known also to the Gentiles.* Nor would I deny that there have been foreign writers, Gentiles, with whom the mention of this most sacred name is found. But then these were speaking—not about their own affairs, but—about the affairs and sacred customs of the Jews. I have not yet been able to find any sufficient indication that among the Greeks or any other heathens any use was made in their home-worship of the name IAO derived from the Hebrew. And those who think thus, as GROTIUS, PEARSON, BOCHART,—most eminent men, and remarkably adorned with every kind of learning,—are reduced to these straits, that they are obliged to betake themselves to this very oracle of the Clarian Apollo, as to a sacred anchor.

'But if, as those learned men desire, the real author of that oracle had been devoted to the worship of the gods, and had spoken about them things already known to his people and familiarised by use, it would follow certainly that the IAO, about whom he writes, is only some name or surname of the Sun, signifying a certain relation in which he stands to our world; for this is indicated very plainly by the whole context and order of the oracle. I ask, then, among what people of Greece had Sol, while in the winter-solstice, the name IAO? And why should that IAO, *i.e.* the winter-sun, have been deemed the highest, and by far the greatest, of all the gods,—greater, therefore, than the Sun of Spring, Summer, and finally of Autumn? Truly, no account of the matter can ever be given by any one out of Greek theology. Who ever heard mention made of IAO as a deity of the Greeks? In fact, learned and impartial judges of these matters will readily grant to me that no part of the argument of this oracle is taken from Greek theology or belongs to it.*

'But in the theology of the Gnostics of Basilides everything will be plain, easy, and perspicuous. In order that this matter may be duly and correctly understood, a few observations must be here premised.

'(i) The use of the name IAO was very great and frequent in the schools of the Gnostics. Very many of the Ancient Fathers of the Church in express terms testify to this; and the numerous Abraxas gems, to be seen in museums, proclaim this yet more clearly. For many of these jewels exhibit distinctly the name IAO, which was held very sacred by this Society.

---

* The oracle appears to describe that which was at the basis of the Greek theology, but belonged originally to the more oriental religions, from which the Greek was derived. But the Greek religion had the cries Ἴα, εὐοῖ, Ἰαχχε, &c., all showing a connection with יהוה or IAO. *Ed.*

'(ii) Although the true signification, which this name had in the schools of the Gnostics, requires still much more light to be thrown upon it, yet I have made it out to my own entire satisfaction, as I have partly shown in another place, and as these Abraxas gems so clearly indicate, that the Gnostics used to express by this name, which by them was held especially venerable, the most excellent Saviour.

'(iii) This being admitted,—and I hardly think that it will be with reason denied or called into question—this fact also should be noticed, *viz.* that these Gnostics, about whom I am speaking, frequently shadowed forth in their schools our Saviour by the emblem and symbol of the *Sun*, and took singular delight in this emblematical comparison, as I remember also to have demonstrated formerly at considerable length. As such, then, He is depicted also in our oracle under the name IAO.

'(iv) Whereas, however, this IAO is called by the epithet ἁβρός, *i.e.* as I think it should be translated, *tender*, *youthful*, the author of this oracle wishes us to think of Jesus Christ, as *just born of the virgin*, and still a *tender infant*.

'(v) And this is the reason why the Gnostic author of the oracle has placed the tender IAO in μεσοπώρῳ, or the beginning of winter, or, what amounts to the same thing, in the winter solstice. For this expression ought to be understood not only of the natural Sun, spoken of in the preceding lines, but also of the mystic emblematical Sun, the Lord Christ. For the natural Sun is renovated in the winter solstice, whence at that season the Romans were wont to call him *The New Sun*, and the Egyptians, *Osiris found* and *reborn*. And for this reason, no doubt, the Gnostics also threw the birthday of our Saviour, their mystic emblematical Sun, into this season, and so celebrated regularly in their assemblies the memory of that great divine benefit.

'And now the true meaning of this Gnostic oracle may be rightly and easily perceived by us, something as follows:—

'The supreme Deity, forsooth, is our IAO, Christ Jesus the Lord, the first and the last, the true *Sun* of righteousness, and Light of this world, the Sun who inaugurates and completes the year of salvation and of the good pleasure of the Lord. You, ye servants of idols, celebrate the Sun in autumn as Serapis the invisible,—when spring comes, as bright Jupiter Ammon—as Horus in summer, glittering with the flashes of his rays,—and in the winter-solstice as the tender Harpocrates. But the true Sun of Salvation, and He the supreme Lord and God of all, is our IAO, whose birth and memory we celebrate, as of the mystic Sun of righteousness, at that season in which the natural Sun, the creature of our IAO, is renovated in the sky.'

54. Upon the above reasoning we remark as follows. Admitting, with JABLONSKY, that the Gnostics *did* use the name IAO to express Jesus Christ, yet the question then arises, *Why* did they choose this particular name? It is true, certainly, that the Hebrew word JHVH was expressed by IAO, as appears not only from the passages already quoted (II.333), but from a variety of other proofs. Thus, according to HESYCH. Ὀζείας (Uzziah) = ἰσχὺς Ἰαώ, 'strength of IAO,' and Ἰωαθάμ (Jotham) = Ἰαὼ συντελεία, 'perfection of IAO,' and, according to ORIGEN, on Dan.ii., Ἱερεμίας =

μετεωρισμὸς Ἰαώ, 'lifting-up of IAO.' So TZETZES, *Chiliad.* vii. 126, says, Ἑβραϊκὸς τὸ ΙΑΩ ἀόρατον σημαίνει, 'in Hebrew IAO signifies Unseen;' and IRENÆUS *adv. Hær.* ii. 66, quotes the name as *Jaoth*, which, though corrected by GESENIUS into *Jaoh*, is probably correct, since in H. STEPHEN'S *Thesaurus*, we find the following form of oath, Ὁρκίζω σε τὸ ὄνομα τὸ μέγα Ἰαὼθ Σαβαὼθ, ὁ θεὸς ὁ στηρίξας τὴν γῆν, 'I adjure thee by the great name Iaoth-Sabaoth, the God who stablished the earth.' Accordingly, in PEARSON *On the Creed* (Burton), *p.* 126, we have this note:—'So EUSEBIUS, *Dem. Evang.* IV. *ad finem*, c. 17, *p.* 199. D, Ἰησοῦς δέ ἐστιν Ἰαὼ σωτηρία, τοῦτ' ἔστι, θεοῦ σωτήριον, ['now Joshua means *salvation of* IAO, that is, salvation of God,'] where nothing can be more certain than that IAO is taken for the name of God . . . . and *is certainly no other than* יהוה.'

55. But there is no reason to suppose that the Gnostics adopted the name on this account, so as to declare by it that Jesus Christ was no other than the Jehovah of the Jews. Rather, it is plain from JABLONSKY'S own reasoning that they used it for Jesus Christ, because, as he says, they 'frequently shadowed forth in their schools our Saviour by the emblem and symbol of the *Sun*, and took singular delight in this emblematical comparison,' and because IAO, as we have seen, was the great mysterious name of the Sun-God. It was the name, however, of the Sun, 'at the end of autumn, and so at the *beginning* of winter,' as JABLONSKY says, but *not* at the *middle* of winter, 'the winter Sun,' 'in the winter-solstice,' as he also says: for this latter the oracle itself plainly declares to be *Aides*, and not Adonis or IAO.

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

00059228

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 25 June, 2016